The Forum

MARCH, 1896.

FAMILY LIFE IN AMERICA.

NOTHING is more difficult than to give an opinion of a country where we have received hospitality, and especially a hospitality so incomparably warm and generous as that of America. Whether we praise lavishly or venture to blame, two perils threaten us—the danger of being blinded by remembered benefits, and the possibility of failing to fulfil the most elementary obligations of good breeding. Commonplaces or ingratitude, we escape the one but to fall into the other, and perhaps it would be wiser to say nothing at all.

If, however, one decides to speak, the only road to follow is the perfectly clear path of sincerity and good faith. This course I have pursued throughout the long series of articles, published during 1895 in the "Revue des Deux Mondes," upon the condition of woman in the United States.[1] These articles reflect what I have seen, while I have tried to avoid rash conclusions, the justice of which no traveller, after six months of wandering in a new world, would reasonably care to assume. These random notes, in spite of their inevitable shortcomings, have excited a very great interest in France, and, what is of far greater importance, a generous emulation. I speak frankly, having no reason to be modest upon this point, since the success achieved is entirely due to the subject treated. During the course of this publication, now ended, nothing has touched me more than the kindness of the American press and the sympathy expressed by those individuals whom, not without a certain anxiety, I had introduced to the public.

[1] Since published in book form by Calmann Lévy, Paris: "Les Américaines chez elles."

Copyright, 1895, by the Forum Publishing Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the intelligence of American women apparently enables them to hear without irritation whatever is said of them, if it be said in the spirit and solely for the sake of truth; they know how to look at things from another's point of view; I believe that they are even capable of making use of the mistaken judgment of a foreigner, discovering in the sources of his error material for instructive comparisons of the education, character, and national prejudices of the two peoples. Convinced, after this delicate test, of the absence of narrow-mindedness among my American friends, I shall speak to them of themselves with even less fear than when I discussed them behind their backs, so to speak,—to the French public.

This question has been put to me: "What do you think of family life in America?" And again I shall reply without evasion.

Whatever has made our own love and happiness must seem of more value than a state of things which interests our neighbor, but which we ourselves but half comprehend; for if there be a point upon which the differences of sentiment and organization are completely and strongly marked in the two countries, which otherwise have many traits in common, it is this of home life. The family, despite the ferments of transformations which have, little by little, been effected by contact with other nations, reminds us still, in Latin countries, of what it once was in Rome. Certainly paternal authority is no longer unlimited, as it was in the days of old; it is not even what it was in France before the Revolution, when a father's will alone was sufficient to shut a daughter within convent walls or a son behind prison bars; but although it rests now upon fewer recognized rights, it is still very strong. The father is still, in the full significance of the term, the head of the family to such a degree that the truth is revealed, to those who look deeply into the matter, that in the young republic which aspires to be the France of to-day there still throbs the heart of the old monarchy, armed with divine right. Everywhere the family is the prototype of the nation, and the French nation has the same inalienable habits of administration, subordination, hierarchy, and direction, even in those crises when she seems to wander farthest away from all regard for these things; she has, pre-eminently, a social instinct which demands a distribution of parts, so to speak, in the interests of a harmonious whole, to which each one must contribute his share according to the measure of his capacities.

It is recognized in France that the father's duty is to govern and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

provide for his household, to increase the inheritance left him by his ancestors and the dowry brought him by his wife, or, having neither, to supply the family needs by his own exertions. Upon the mother rests the responsibility of household affairs; this is her particular and well-defined domain, together with the education of her daughters, which she conducts to her own liking; usually keeping them under her personal influence, guarding them like little children until their marriage, which is proposed and arranged by the parents. The career of the son is likewise a subject of deep concern to all the members of his family, who do not hesitate to influence the young man in this or that direction; opposing what seems to them an unwise vocation and giving him, except in rare instances, as little opportunity as possible to depend upon his own judgment and capacity.

There is in France a constant exchange of consideration and protection, which has seemed to me scarcely to exist in the American family,—where the individuality of each member asserts itself from the cradle, where each one is astonishingly eager to follow an independent career and to assume the responsibility of his own destiny. In America I have been struck by the absence of that unity of the family, as we understand it: that willingness of some (who are usually women) to sacrifice themselves for the comfort and pleasure of others, that desire to remain united at all costs; and my first impressions were these:—the almost insolent triumph of youth, the boldly advertised domination of woman, the effacement of parents and their lack of authority over their children, the apparent coldness of their reciprocal relations, or, where this was not the case, a certain affectation in emphasizing it, as though it were something quite unusual. I have therefore been greatly surprised when I have heard Americans who have lived a long time in France, assert on their side that the mutual relations between parent and child were on the contrary less affectionate there than in America. Besides this, we French—everybody says it of us and it must therefore be true—have the least sentiment of any people in the world. I had always believed that whatever of sentiment we possessed was concentrated, to a degree almost unknown elsewhere, in the intensity of maternal love (a thing easily explained by the infrequency of love marriages, in the real sense of the term, which are contracted in France), and that this adds to the maternal devotion so much the more of emotion,—nay, passion. Ah well! I am mistaken, it seems; the union is much closer in America. I have not only heard this said, but I have read it in excellent books. Yet, I cannot help protesting.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I begged for explanations,—proofs. "Do you know many families in France?" I ask, and they answer, "You do not have the winter-evening readings in your French home circles"; "No," I reply at once, "because we have conversation; we talk with one another, which prevents reading aloud, and to give another reason, we do not read together because the books written for our children are not generally such as would interest older people."

"Are your children brought forward as prominently there as ours are here?" some one asks me. "Have they as important a place in your homes as we give them in ours?" "No," I should say in reply, "because with us the laws of good breeding demand, on the one hand, that the children shall be strictly guarded and constantly directed, and on the other, that they shall be taught not to annoy any one, not to put themselves forward; and so they learn early that they are not to be noticed. If we speak of them as little as possible, it is because we consider the *I* in conversation hateful, and since our children are ourselves, we rarely discuss them. But this is a point of breeding. The bottom of the matter has not been touched by such considerations." These misconceptions of French life, however, put me on guard against my own first impressions of American homes, and especially in regard to the expression of sentiment.

I reflect: We on our part consider the Anglo-Saxons much colder than ourselves because a voluntary moral restraint has taught them a much greater degree of self-control; and they find us lacking in feeling, because we imbue the expression of our feeling with our native qualities of tact and moderation. The acting of American or even English players seems to us excessively and singularly emphatic; the acting of French actors seems to Americans to leave too much to be divined; we are grateful to our novelists for avoiding a moral which has been repeated to us a hundred times, for sparing us the commonplace of a purely conventional plot. The plot of a French novel is only a pretext for the expression of ideas and the development of characters. Americans demand in advance of their writers of fiction—and they have excellent ones—that they tell them stories in which the wicked and the virtuous reap as they have sown. For this reason, by the way, their family readings in the evenings are more easily arranged. What does all this prove except that they are young and we are mature,—a truth which in many ways is very apparent. Now, it is natural in immature civilizations that everything should be sacrificed to those who represent progress, hope, intense life. Hence the license of chil-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dren and young girls, the insignificant part played by older persons, the hasty putting away of the dead, the absence of that reverence at the grave which is so marked in an old European country which, though chilled by centuries of growth, still pays respect and still honors and regrets what has gone, finding consolation for the threatening uncertainty of the future in the splendors of the past.

This harshness of a merciless youth is of course much more strongly marked in the working-classes; "*l'homme du peuple*," as one calls him in Europe, has the advantage in America of more education but much less refinement of behavior. One can scarcely realize the mutual affection and devotion that exists among this same class in France. M. Zola has succeeded in lending a coarse and brutal physiognomy to the peasants of his "La Terre," by concentrating in a single village all the crimes committed in the whole republic during a number of years. It is this exaggeration and agglomeration, this trick of producing fine but extravagant results, that one may observe in the description of that impossible garden in "La Faute de l'Abbé Mouret," where flowers of all seasons blossom at once. In spite of the greed, the worldly covetousness, the inordinate attachment to whatever he inherits, which characterize him, and notwithstanding the deplorable ambition he has lately developed to make a citizen of his son at any cost,—the real French peasant, with his good and his bad traits, is much nearer in point of resemblance to "George Sand's" idealized portraits than to those fantastic caricatures that the most powerful of our realistic writers has made of him. Those who have come in contact with, and have closely observed, the rustic life of our people, have found there some beautiful traces of the old patriarchal manners. One cannot realize, I repeat, how many old parents, living in the poorest attics of Paris, are tenderly cared for by children whose first duty is their comfort, nor how faithfully the ties of blood are held between brothers and sisters, how religiously the law, "Bear ye one another's burdens," is fulfilled by people who have otherwise no religion. On the other hand, it has seemed to me that in America when a man enters upon his career, he becomes absorbed in his individual interests to the exclusion of all others: brimming over with physical energy and pre-occupied with personal affairs, he soon loses regard for home ties, which are broken by absence and a life of adventure.

Speaking of American women, the "homes" and "clubs" for the working classes among them, so excellent in themselves, must, it seems to me, necessarily tend toward the dissolution of the family. They

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

often secure the welfare of the individual only by uprooting her from her natural surroundings. The general striving after instruction, the frequent contempt for needlework and other humble occupations of the household, must of course separate the poor girl from her own people and class; and all that she gains intellectually in the "struggle for life" does not always strengthen her in the homely quality of goodness of heart; instruction that fosters ambition is not the education that elevates the soul, and may sometimes even become its worst enemy. It is especially important in a working family that each member should be content to be nothing more than a wheel in the clockwork, contributing his best efforts to maintain the regularity of the whole. But what would become of American individualism if it had to play such a humble part in the machinery? The aversion to domestic service, and consequently the recognized need of servants, sufficiently proves a general rebellion. There is no country, on the contrary, where the family, including the servants, are so closely united as in France. And yet, not only in America, but in all countries where English is spoken, they pity us because we have no expression for that intimate and delightful word "home," which occurs so constantly with them!

In vain do we tell them many times over, that if we have not the word, we have the thing in the highest degree, the real home being the unity of the family, which is elsewhere more scattered. It is true that the home in France does not always mean a separate establishment such as the poorest individual who has a drop of Anglo-Saxon blood is ambitious to possess. The isolation of the family within walls that shelter it from all promiscuous association, and defend it from intrusions, contributes surely to its privacy. To be ranged, one over the other, like cells in a beehive, in apartments that may be taken by the year and as easily abandoned, is a subject of horror to Americans. They see in this sort of establishment little more than a perch: *une installation sur la branche*, which surely ought not to frighten those who in their turn enjoy hotel life. But as Emile Augier says in a verse that deserves to be simple prose: "The tavern does not harm the home."

It was perhaps in Philadelphia that I felt most fully the force of that sentiment which surrounds the American home and the influence it may exert upon the morality of a nation. This city has, I was told—and its aspect justifies the assertion—a greater number of small houses than any other, and has instituted a philanthropic movement designed to give to the poorest of its citizens the opportunity of becoming in a few years the owners of their homes. I have never, perhaps, felt such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

veneration in viewing the splendors of European palaces, as filled me when I beheld the modest relics of the ancient State House and those great institutions which prove what noble pains Philadelphians have taken to develop art and science in their city; not excepting industrial art, in honor of which no more magnificent temple has been erected than the Drexel Institute. Yet, aside from its University and its learned societies, it is as "the city of homes" that I remember Philadelphia.

To whatever class a man may belong, it is a blessing if, in the hardening struggle for existence which so often leads him far away from home surroundings, he is able to fix his thoughts upon the permanent abiding-place of the family,—the home fireside, where on holidays children and grandchildren may gather around the parental table once more. If one has ever had the good fortune to be admitted to one of these family re-unions in America, the recollection of it is forcibly recalled by each recurring date: Thanksgiving, the cheerful holiday, enjoyed by all classes, rich and poor, young and old, when the inevitable turkey and mince-pie are eaten with gratitude for benefits received during the year; Christmas with its traditional tree, the season of merry-making and exchanging of gifts, when pine-boughs and mistletoe and red-berried holly wreaths adorn the walls and hang at the windows; Easter with its symbolic lilies and beautiful custom of flower-giving and all its joy and gayety! Nothing in France gives the least idea of all this. On such holidays, in America, the most hardened and degraded prodigal son must smell from afar the odor of the fatted calf roasted in honor of his return, and be impelled in spite of himself to go back to his father's house. I must say here, in passing, that in France the prodigal rarely strays beyond Paris. In America he goes to the Far West, for the same species of swine do not herd in the boulevard and the backwoods: they suggest very different reflections.

But, to continue, never have the paternal roof and the least of its relics been so treasured and so much dwelt upon as among Americans. We French are not travellers and rarely leave our homes. That which one has at hand is always of less value than that which is enhanced by the magic of distance; and so the people who are the greatest worshippers of home are, it may be noticed, always travelling, and their adoration of these homes does not prevent them from letting them by contract to strangers while they themselves try a camp life elsewhere. Nothing is more opposed to French prejudices than such a proceeding; a Frenchman would consider his household gods desecrated, if they had no other protection than the walls of a hired apartment. I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might with a slight variation repeat the proverb, "What is truth on one side of the Pyrenees is error on the other." There is another point of difference which seems to be all in favor of the Americans, —the doors of their homes open so much more readily in the name of hospitality. We seldom suspect the impression that a city like Paris makes upon foreigners "who know it only from the splendor of the streets," as a distinguished American lady once said to me, "because its doors are so closely shut." The reception we give foreigners is, I may say, merely external; we do not know how to put ourselves at the disposal of strangers from the other end of the world, treating them as friends at first sight. Besides, we draw into our shells with a sort of suspicion. It is this very exclusiveness, by the way, which gave birth to our "salons," which are nothing more than cliques.

Leaving the shell let us pass to its inhabitant; instead of the home itself let us speak of the family which dwells there, and let us begin, if you will, with him who is called the head.

The father is, as a general rule, very different in America from what he is in Europe. He does not expect to meet with such blind submission, nor does he feel himself bound by so narrow duties. He is not obliged to give his daughters a dowry, for instance. He can let his native city profit by a share of the fortune he has made, without his sons ever thinking of grumbling at the expensive founding of some establishment for the public good. It is their affair to get rich by their own industry, and in their turn to perform acts of good citizenship. The American who inherits a ready-made fortune often loses those fine qualities that I have hailed in him with admiration: enterprise, pluck, grit, incomparable will-power—he then resembles the sons of our aristocracy, except that he bears his leisure with less elegance. But nothing has struck me so much as to see of how little consequence a father of a family can be, in his own house, in certain circles in New York, for instance. I have visited houses where he seemed only to have dropped in by accident, as one might say, evidently at a loss to recognize most of the invited guests, and yet showing himself most hospitable with the good-will of his hand-shake and his smile, and repeating, almost as if he did not know to whom he was speaking, that everlasting, trivial phrase "Glad to see you." The magnificent house showed great luxury, the source of which was evidently the incessant effort of this man who worked for others and provided for their pleasures so lavishly. In other places I have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attended large dinner-parties given in the absence of the master of the house. The liberty in this respect is general: this or that one of the sons or daughters accepts an invitation without troubling himself or herself about a reception at home that night, and no one even thinks of making excuses. Each has his friends, his social duties, his separate existence, and disposes of his time as seems best to himself. Self-sacrifice, if perchance it showed itself, often seemed to me to meet with an indifference that was not very encouraging—nor does one sacrifice one's self unless one be the father of the family, who certainly practises self-immolation to an unusual degree. He often works in harness at home, while his family passes years in Europe leading that purely worldly life which the American colony in Paris exhibits to us, all under the pretext that travelling develops the young people, that Miss Mary needs to catch the pure French accent, that Miss Sally must cultivate her musical talent in Germany, that the nervous prostration of their mother demands a change of climate. And with what satisfaction does the good man speak of the good time, the success, the progress of these absent ones, whose expenses he defrays without stopping to count them!

This is purely American. I believe, for my part, that one greatly exaggerates the necessity of running to all points of the compass in pursuit of knowledge and health. If one is born in a country which forms a continent in itself, one can find all the necessary change, so far as physical health is concerned, by going from the north to the south, from the mountains to the sea. It would be to the advantage of rich and *blasé* Americans to refresh themselves from time to time by the good provincial customs; to return to those living springs, not only of their democracy, but of their true moral greatness; without counting even the many European things they would find in certain out-of-the-way villages in New England and in certain corners of the West, to which some of the old Puritan stock have transplanted themselves. There they would find fathers of families who have preserved the Old-World ideas of authority, and housewives as we understand them. The South also holds great surprises of this kind.

As to the intellectual culture of which Europe is supposed to be the home—the means of instruction certainly are not wanting now-a-days in any of the great centres in America. He who demands them only from the Old World is behind the times or follows a custom dating back to those old times when the United States had no academies, no colleges, no art collections, no museums. I know very well

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that I may be told that the feeling for beauty can be acquired only in Italy, and I shall hardly dare to reply that this pretended feeling has very often seemed to me nothing but a rather cheap varnish of ready-made opinions. It was probably something like this pretence which suggested to "Mark Twain" his jokes about the art of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

I have often found a great charm of originality in certain Americans who had not travelled, while the annual pilgrims to the land of Art (with a capital A) have, with rare exceptions, repeated to me very much the same things. And the want of variety in the choice of pictures or reproductions of statuary which adorn their houses, always rich but surely showing little individual taste, is a proof of blind following and lack of discernment. A good deal of pretension in the women is the result of this entirely superficial education in art. I have seen a pretty woman, who knew that the expression of her face became easily pathetic, don, without any hesitation, the turban of the Cenci to be photographed in; another, with purely Greek features, accentuated them by having her portrait painted as dressed in the classic *peplum*, the fillet in her hair, and clasping one knee with a pose worthy of a Phædra or Medea. They would all gain if they remained simply themselves, bright and gay Americans,—if they talked of their own literature, which is so rich, instead of dilating by preference on Villon, Mallarmé, or Verlaine. They are brighter than any other women in the world, quite naturally so, and I do not know why the father of the family should be so anxious to add to this brilliancy by pilgrimages to Europe in which he does not take part.

They seem to think, besides, that he is only fulfilling the duty he owes them by acting thus. One whom I congratulated on being immensely indulged by her adoring parents, answered calmly: "Yes, certainly, they watch our development with much interest." The idea that they might think of controlling or even merely of directing this development would never have entered her head. The thought of individual liberty is indeed constantly present in the mind of the father of the family, as it is in the mind of those who are supposed to depend upon him. He has his share of this liberty, as I have already said. Law allows him to dispose of his property as seems best to him, to make his will as he pleases; at the same time it obliges him to take into account the natural rights of each one of his children, in the gravest decisions. The father understands that they can all follow their own vocations, that his son, a mere boy, will fly out of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

home-nest, that his daughter will marry according to her own choice, even should it be done imprudently. Without trying to control their religious faith, he will also give them the example of a religious spirit, which is easy enough, by the way, in a country where each variety of Christianity can find a label to fit it, and where the multiplicity of sects lends itself to the broadest exigencies of free discussion. In praise of America, be it said, the practice of religion is never reduced by men to the function of leading-strings, useful in guiding the uncertain steps of women and children. The father is, or seems to be, in religious fellowship with his family, and this union in the Christian faith surely makes up for much of the superiority of which we boast. The wrong side of the medal, the drawback, in America is perhaps a certain hypocrisy. Alas, where does one not find this untruthfulness and false appearance!

It is fortunate if it helps to strengthen salutary constraint, without which all liberty becomes license. The avowed communion in the faith is certainly the most powerful and most efficacious bond which can bind the family together; besides, this union is sometimes, even in other respects, closer than I have said—another proof that it is dangerous to generalize. If the American business man (and his kind predominates) is almost invisible in his own house, where he expects his wife and daughters to represent those elegances and refinements of which he hardly has time to think except when he pays for them, other classes of individuals, which exist in America as elsewhere—all students for instance, lawyers, physicians, artists, scholars,—are very much less absent from their own homes, and exercise by their mere presence a kind of authority which escapes our notice because it is not proclaimed. I have never seen anything more touching or more perfect than the communion of certain fathers with their unmarried daughters. The intellectual life they shared made them friends by choice, and one can understand that this friendship, without tyranny on one side or dependence on the other, can make the young girl so exacting on the question of marriage that she does not care in the end for any other companion but this beloved master, whose support she becomes in her turn when old age touches him. To understand better what I say, I refer my readers to Miss Sarah Orne Jewett's novel, "A Country Doctor," which is written with such largeness and at the same time with such restraint.

Shall I dare to express my whole idea? The severe education that the American girl receives agrees especially with those who after-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ward choose celibacy. The single woman in the United States is infinitely superior to her European sister; free from the fetters that often make the French old-maid so pitiable and ridiculous, she does not, like the latter, expect to gain liberty by marriage,—on the contrary, by marriage she would lose that perfect independence which allows her to cultivate herself more and more, to rise into a larger sphere than that of the family and even of the ordinary social circle, by consecrating herself to works of universal interest. Her intercourse with men, freed from the childishness of flirtation, bears a stamp of quietness and freedom which allows real and serious intimacies that no criticism could assail. One sees no bitterness, no regrets. Her lot is too beautiful, her life too full, in spite of the natural satisfactions renounced—nay, perhaps just on account of that renunciation. Let there be, however, no misunderstanding. If it seems indispensable to me that the woman who, for some good reason or other, does not marry, should find some sphere for her activity, I severely blame the systematic scorn of marriage which comes to many young Americans who are ambitious *to be somebody, to do something*, to distinguish themselves in a career, and to escape from the common ways. With these pretended vocations there are often mixed a childish vanity, a morbid idea of creating a sensation, of singling one's self out; and obstacles are most useful in proving their real value. Colleges, if made too easily accessible, may, it seems to me, do much harm, and seriously injure family-life by drawing young girls away from it at an age when they ought to take their share in domestic duties. On this point, too, one must say that everything is good or bad according to the way in which it is used, and the spirit in which it is conceived. It is naturally the unmarried women or widows who take a leading position in philanthropic associations and the many clubs, agencies, and the like, which have helped so much to enlighten, elevate, and instruct the population of cities. When the mother of a family devotes herself with the necessary fervor to such objects it always seems to us in France that she must be obliged to neglect some of the essential duties which, according to our way of thinking, must bind the wife to her hearth-stone. But perhaps we have not taken into account that devouring and almost feverish activity which enables an American woman to manage well so many enterprises at once.

If I had been questioned about the American mother before having been in the country several weeks, I should have run the risk of making far more silly remarks about her than now, in spite of whatever

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hurried travellers may say about the penetration and freshness of first impressions. My first impression, I confess had been, that the school usurped the functions of the mother and that she left her children to its mercies as soon as they had learned to speak, thus renouncing all responsibility for their physical and moral, as well as for their intellectual education. That would have been a great exaggeration. The American mother is not, like the French one, wholly absorbed in her daughters; these receive an education very much like that of their brothers, but brothers and sisters return after school-hours, and maternal solicitude has all the time every means of exercising itself. A very intelligent woman, whom I told that our conventionally trained girls mostly confined themselves, under their mother's wing, to following private or public courses of lectures, said with surprise: "But how can they bear to miss having their boy and girl friends? The solid and really intimate friendships are formed at school. It is there that our daughters go through their apprenticeship for life. Without this initiation your young people must be sadly unfitted at their entrance into the world. The mother who brings up her daughter alone takes a very great and proud responsibility, but she can form her only after her own image and it seems to me that in a short time these two inseparables must make themselves too necessary to each other. Is n't it serious enough to choose a husband for the poor child? Do you really refuse her also the pleasure of choosing her own friends?"

"They could only be girl-friends," I answered, "co-education is unknown with us."

As we talked together I understood that the part of the mother of a family is perhaps a more delicate one in America than in France, just because there the power of the mother is not that of an autocrat, because she does not direct and rule everything herself, because there are many things in her daughter's life which she does not think herself authorized to prevent, and which she has to bear, while exercising a discreet vigilance. She advises without constraining, and under the gravest circumstances she has to limit herself to an appeal to her daughter's reason, without ever counting on passive obedience. It is certainly simpler to mould, like soft wax, a will that gives itself up without resistance. It is just the feeling of this unlimited authority over her daughter, of the good and the wrong she may do her, of her rigorous duty to this utter helplessness, which binds the French mother so passionately to her second self,—whom she has formed without any other influence, admitting even girl-companions unwil-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lingly, and on her guard, beforehand, against the future husband who would take her treasure from her. These relations are being modified since the introduction of a certain cosmopolitanism into our customs; but what exists everywhere with us could not be found in America, where the young bird, of either sex, escapes from the maternal wing as soon as its feathers begin to grow.

Neither have I ever seen anything that resembled those warm effusions of tenderness, that enthusiastic confidence, which exist with us between mother and son. This explains itself in a country where men are so early taken hold on by the realities of life. I certainly admire the vigor and enterprise of the average American boy, his way of starting out, almost without looking back, to conquer the world, and so having a vastly greater field of action than our French lads. Though his motive power is very often the desire for money, I do not mind, since he earns this money himself instead of expecting it from the accident of a legacy or a wife's dowry; but it is certain that long separations, business cares, violent competition, the inveterate habit of "self-control" produce (at least on the surface) a certain hardness, which makes impossible the kind of intimacy between mother and son that always charms and surprises foreigners living in France. For this intimacy more "womanliness" is needed in the man than usually exists in the "muscular Christian" in America, and on the other hand a knowledge of life in general and of the masculine being in particular is necessary in the woman, but quite incompatible with the American ideal of "womanliness" which seems to us a little artificial. This ideal consists really in systematically ignoring what is quite evident. However guarded a life a Frenchwoman may have lived—when she marries she knows many things which the more emancipated American constantly refuses to admit. She knows that as man is exposed by his nature, his education, and the wear and tear of life to more dangers than herself, she cannot expect in him exactly the same delicacy and the same purity that he demands justly from her. Ready for all sacrifices and all devotion that may guard him, she yet only half counts on that absolute faithfulness, in which she herself cannot be wanting without forfeiting her honor. A defensive instinct makes her very clear-sighted as to passions and inclinations that have to be checked. If intelligent Americans, such as I have met, should affect, before her, to believe in the same moral practice for both sexes she would smile, as she is apt to smile, not cynically but with sad resignation, at such conventional fictions as "a only love, a broken heart, etc." She knows

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the absolute and the definite abound more in novels than in real life, the complex shades of which do not escape her; she is not satisfied with mere words. She is also capable of giving to her husband, son, or brother advice that no American son, brother, or husband would ever ask from the women of his family. These have another system, which is perhaps as efficacious in its way; and I suppose they try not to lower themselves in the respect of women, who expect so much of them.

But there is a great deal of conventionality in the relations between men and women in America, and the foreigner who travels in the United States is more struck with it than with anything else. In France one meets more sincerity in this respect, a sincerity coupled with common sense, which is the reason why a book like "The Heavenly Twins," for instance, makes no other impression than that of bad taste, exaggeration, and nonsense. Nor would the Frenchwoman, who is the least disposed to tamper with vice, ever understand the indignant stupor of the mother of *Pendennis*, when she discovers that her son, a gentleman, could have had anything to say to a little milliner. The Americans, on the contrary,—and be it well understood that I do not speak here of that ultra fashionable set which makes a profession of being *blasé*, but the Americans who represent our middle-class,—seemed to me to be still living in those happy illusions of *Mrs. Pendennis*. I believe there are no women on this earth more calmly sure of the fidelity of their husbands, and there are probably in fact more happy marriages in America than anywhere else. But I also think—if I may be allowed to say so—that a happy union in France, though much rarer, ranks first just because there can be no question there of that equality of which Tennyson says,—

> "Let . . . this proud watchword rest
> Of equal; seeing either sex alone
> Is half itself . . ."

Not when the woman of the house pursues her individual way apart from that of her husband, instead of using her intelligence to understand, help, and complement him, can that divine union be produced:—

> "Purpose in purpose, will in will, they grow,
> The single pure and perfect animal,
> The two-cell'd heart, beating with one full stroke,
> Life."

To me—a Frenchwoman—the true reign of the wife and of the mother seems to consist in the unremitting accomplishment of a thousand small things. It is this, perhaps, which keeps woman from that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

continuous devotion to one idea, from which, according to Buffon, the works of genius are born. But she who, as an exception, has a work of genius in her mind will be forced to let it out even if all the fine meshes of the net woven around her should have to be torn. The work of genius of the others, of the majority, will be a faultless household. It is well not to disgust young girls with that, and my view may appear founded on routine—but it is also founded on human nature, which it is never wise to oppose. If girls in France are brought up a little too exclusively with a view to please their future husbands, the Americans are perhaps too much concerned with the purpose of personal development, and both systems have their inconveniences.

As to morals, properly speaking, it is quite evident that in a society where flirtation is allowed, on principle, only to girls, and where the *demi-monde* has only the coarsest equivalents for it, temptations must be less strong and less frequent for that sex which in this respect is really the weak one. Besides, in spite of the honorable privileges which she enjoys, woman certainly does not, in an existence swallowed up by business and relieved by sport, occupy that immense place which she fills with us in the mind of man. I believe besides that a certain number of puritanical convictions are still ruling American society as firmly as ever. To suppose that society is more virtuous in one country than in another would be very simple-minded; but nowhere will society give us those specimens of model families which we are seeking. If we speak of it for a moment, however, I should say, that even in that elegant and frivolous world such situations, of which one makes a *vaudeville* with us, such as "Le Plus Heureux des Trois," are very rare in the United States. For that reason, persons who have a taste for such things gladly cross the ocean to profit by the liberties that are offered by old civilizations, and often exceed the bounds which such civilizations authorize.

Of course one suspects in America, as in England, that the moral condition in France is deplorable, and injurious to the dignity of the family. On the other hand, one does not seem to know in the least that flirtation transplanted from America into certain Parisian circles inspires in us a horror equal to that with which Puritans severely regard *sin*, because we do not see in flirtation the excuse of an irresistible passion. Flirtation is a constant transgression of the law: "Thou shalt not play with love." In its native country it may be rendered inoffensive most of the time by the temperament and the habits of those who give themselves up to it. It all depends on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

partner one has in this game,—on the conventionality on which one rests,—on the education which has prepared us for it. Co-education radically modifies the elements that enter into the future intercourse between men and women. It tempers maidenly shyness on the one side and passion on the other, it clothes the young girl in an armor of assurance and fills the young man with reserve and respect. I believe that it has, at the bottom, a better effect on him than on her.

Long habit prevents most of the inconveniences that we should expect. From the kindergarten onward, the future woman learns to guard herself, and receives from her masculine comrades those protecting attentions which they will show toward her all her life. I imagine besides that the American woman, even the somewhat fast one, becomes more prudent than our scepticism would admit, when she has no chaperon to protect her temerity. This chaperon, whose presence permits a young lady to dine at Delmonico's in male society, is chosen in such a way as to have nothing in common with the "inconvenient third." Left to herself the young lady would be even more safe, and I have heard good judges disapprove of this innovation as one liable to abuse. Does not this prove that customs which have descended through generations had better be kept up and that, if the Americans do not gain anything by going back toward the *duennas*, we should do well in France, for the same reason, not to advance too quickly on the road opened up by the bachelor-girls?

The class of American girls which deserves our interest still more, belongs—and there are many examples—to that intrepid and somewhat hard type which Henry James has painted in his "Portrait of a Lady";—*Isabel Archer*, so eager to know everything, so little curious to know what it is to love! The best of them are wanting in humility, that humility which belongs to tenderness. They are self-possessed to a degree of which we cannot conceive, with a foundation of dryness and inevitable egotism. One must lay the stress on this double fault, instead of harping, as one does too much in Europe, on the worst sides of a most objectionable flirtation. This is just as much out of place, by the way, as the charge of wickedness which is brought so often in America against the matrimonial customs of France and the novels that are supposed to portray them. I for one am inclined to consider flirtation as an equivalent,—a somewhat coarse, heavy, exaggerated equivalent,—of French coquetry. The liberty which a young girl enjoys in her father's house does not necessarily cause her to flirt, with or without a serious intention, and this is, I repeat, because she does not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

need to marry, as the French girl does, in order to cease being a charming nonentity. She goes out, reads what she likes, receives and pays visits at her pleasure. This can only scandalize those who have not been in America, and who do not know how ungentlemanly every importunate or sentimental attention is considered when offered to a young lady in a car or in the street. For this reason the girl looks the men in the face with a calm boldness that is almost defiant.

As for books, there are no vicious ones, that is to say, none that descends far into the depths of vice. American girls have therefore no literature apart from the rest,—one writes only for them, even if art should lose! They come first, even before art. Verlaine and Villon, you ask? Even they are purged for their use; all the lions have their claws cut and their teeth drawn for the greater security of these young ladies. They strike the key-note of conversation in society, and the young men probably profit less than they would do with us, by a *tête à tête* to which they are accustomed. The arrangement of rooms almost without any doors, with looped-up *portières* everywhere, allowing an even warmth from the furnace in the most modest apartments, makes it possible for Mademoiselle to receive her male friends without excessive privacy. Of course these privileges are used or abused according to the good or bad manners, the tact or vulgarity of those who possess them, according to the influence of the surroundings, the more or less refined habits of the world in which they live; they may be used only with discretion, but in no case would one dream of contesting these privileges of youth.

To resume: The American family is less homogeneous than the French family, less united in the same interests, less blindly submissive to the authority of a head, who does not feel himself tied or constrained by such narrow duties. One finds much less formality there, than with us. Long before going to America I heard a lady from the West say in connection with all the fuss necessary in France before any one can be married: "I have no certificate of birth. All my father did was to write the name of each child on the first page of the family Bible, as soon as it had come into the world!"

The regulating of what with us is called a "*faux ménage*," a free union, the position of an illegitimate child,—all that is much more easily managed in America than in France, because the question is not how to avoid at any price the intrusion of an illegitimate child into the patrimony and the name, or how to protect the feudal stronghold of the family, but rather to gain a victory for those eternal rights

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the individual. There is perhaps a danger in France that we may arrive at too complete a forgetfulness of our fellow-men through too great a love for our own family; many women especially perceive humanity only very vaguely outside their own household; in America public spirit fills a large place in the woman's heart beside the more elastic duties of the wife and mother. As to the man, he is a citizen in a way that has no value in France, where military service is still the chief expression of patriotism. He usually thinks himself bound to acts of filial devotion toward the State to which he belongs, toward his native place, toward what we call *le clocher*. One will have to arrive by degrees at a wisely defined care for public interests, which, so long as none of the property-holders neglects his common duty, is equal to the vaster but much vaguer and easily eccentric humanitarianism of Tolstoi. The great social questions that force themselves on the whole world will oblige all nations to consider more and more seriously those words of Christ, who, disregarding his own household, pointed to the people and said: "Behold my mother and my brethren." Every one of the property-holding classes is in duty bound to help the people, and America understands this much better than Europe; she is in advance of Europe on this point as on many others. The example she gives will grow and cross the seas. The type of the American family is very likely the one that will at last prevail: the laws of progress, the better recognized rights of women, the necessity for our men to expatriate themselves, to leave the exhausted Old World where their activity no longer finds occupation and to scatter themselves abroad, the growing influx of foreign customs—all this heralds it.

Besides its form of government, we have already imported from America that great dissolvent of the old organization of the family —divorce; we already discuss the advisability of standing armies, and the right to perfect freedom in making one's will[1] has numerous advocates. Already the "interview," long unknown, and abhorred merely by reputation, steals into the most carefully guarded homes and accustoms the people who were till now most jealous of the privacy of their lives to the unhealthy notoriety of the newspapers; already *lycées* for girls rise up against the home education, which had before lessened the importance of the convents. Our girls are getting comparatively emancipated; they have even reached

[1] In France a man may, according to law, will one fourth of his fortune as he pleases, but he must leave the rest to his immediate family.—*Translator.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that ungrateful period of emancipation, where one wields but awkwardly the weapons one has learned to use too late. At balls the young ladies are no longer taken back to their mothers, who have ceased to mount guard over them, sitting like wall-flowers around the ballrooms. Unmarried ladies of thirty or thirty-five decide to go out alone and to read books that are allowed without question to a young married woman of eighteen. It is a slow but sure revolution. A certain prejudiced class still remains recalcitrant, but it will soon have to follow suit.

I hope all the same that for some centuries yet we may keep certain heritages of the past—our deference to old age, our respect for paternal advice, and that tenderness for a mother that is like a religion. I hope progress will leave us a tolerance for each other's tastes, the polishing away of those angles of the personality that are too sharp, and a good share of that spirit of self-sacrifice which may be called nothing but foolishness, though it is a sacred foolishness of a most heroic kind. I should like to keep, besides, that healthy feeling, till now instilled into our women, that experience is above all systems, that our instinct is a power not to be suppressed, while it ought to be directed, and that certain things felt quite naturally by them, are more precious than what may be acquired by learning. Their grace, their charm, their true beauty, depend on nature; pedagogy does not suffice for everything. Men would be unhappy, without exception, if the type of the learned and strong-minded woman should destroy that of the housewife, which ought not to be incompatible with it. Neither wealth nor learning allows a woman to leave to her servants, even if they should be perfect, the smallest duties of the mistress of the house. Husbands, fathers, brothers of all countries, are sensible of the care that their wives, their daughters, and their sisters take of those every-day trifles that contribute so large a share to the comfort of existence. A woman of genius, Mme. de Staël, has said: "A trifle makes or ruins happiness." This is as true in the material as in the moral world. Let us wish therefore that the women of our Old World may lift their minds more and more above their distaff, but that they may never lose sight of the distaff all the same,—that symbol of so many sweet and touching things which nothing more ambitious can replace.

With these reservations, I for one shall be delighted to see our French society—that is to say, our French family of to-day—become more and more Americanized.

TH. BENTZON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NICARAGUA CANAL AN IMPRACTICABLE SCHEME.

THE popular estimate of the commercial importance of the proposed Nicaragua Canal is based upon an exaggerated estimate of the commercial importance of the Panama Canal. Count de Lesseps came to this country early in 1880 as the advocate and most distinguished proponent of the Panama Canal project. He came with the splendid prestige won at Suez. Under his influence estimates had been put forth, so low as to the cost of the proposed canal, and so high as to the tonnage likely to pass through it, as to excite incredulity even while the world was showering its plaudits upon the so-called "*Terreur des Isthmes.*" These estimates were the correlative features of a scheme which ultimately caused its promoters to find their way into French prisons.

A generous and enthusiastic reception was accorded to Count de Lesseps upon his arrival at New York in February, 1880; but even while awarding him the full measure of honor for the fame he had already won, the American Society of Civil Engineers discarded his estimate of cost, and became incredulous as to the accuracy of his estimate of tonnage,—6,000,000 to 7,000,000 tons a year,—the fact having been discovered that it embraced shipping which would have to go from 3,000 to 8,000 miles out of its way in order to pass through the Panama Canal. Accordingly, at the earnest request of the American Society of Civil Engineers, in my then official capacity as Chief of the Bureau of Statistics in the Treasury Department at Washington, I entered upon the somewhat tedious task of computing the amount of tonnage which would probably pass through "an American interoceanic ship canal," the result reached being quite as applicable to the Nicaragua Canal as to the Panama route. By a liberal treatment of all matters in doubt, I found that 1,625,000 tons of shipping were all that could then be expected to pass through the proposed Canal during a year. This conclusion was generally accepted in the United States and in other countries,—except in France, where the press had been subsidized in the interest of the De Lesseps scheme. My computation involved the consideration of tonnage movements, distances, magnitude of commercial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

currents, nautical conditions, certain physical characteristics of the American continent, and various elements of competition in commerce and in transportation which had an important bearing upon the subject. All these are set forth in my report to the Secretary of the Treasury of August 7, 1880,—a document of 136 pages, and embracing in its appendix sixty-one statements, by specialists and others, on the various topics touched upon in the consideration of the case.

Eight years after the inauguration of work upon the Panama Canal the project culminated in financial disaster. The Nicaragua Canal scheme, which had previously been a mere name, was then vigorously heralded as the only practical solution of the Isthmian canal question. Strange to say its proponents at first adopted the exploded De Lesseps estimate of 6,000,000 to 7,000,000 tons of shipping annually, which estimate, for reasons never explained, has been raised to 8,000,000 tons. Upon this baseless and most ridiculous assumption the Nicaragua Canal Company have for years been engaged in an astounding propaganda, continued even after their project has suffered disastrous failure as a commercial enterprise. The absurdity of the De Lesseps estimate of the tonnage which an American Isthmian canal can command will, I think, clearly appear from the following consideration of facts and governing conditions.

There is a nautical condition which will always operate as a stringent limitation upon American Isthmian traffic. Both sides of the Isthmus are in the calm belt or "doldrums." This constitutes an insuperable obstacle to commerce in sailing-vessels by the Nicaragua Canal route. That eminent authority in physical geography, Lieutenant Maury, of the United States Navy, pointed to this fact, many years ago, in the following words:—

> "Should nature, by one of her convulsions, rend the American continent in twain, and make a channel across the Isthmus of Panama or Darien, as deep, as wide, and as free as the Straits of Dover, it would never become a channel for sailing-vessels, saving the outward bound or those which could reach it with leading winds."

This nautical condition would shut off from the Nicaragua route the nitrates of Chili and Peru, the wheat of California, the lumber of Oregon and Washington, and all other sailing-vessel cargoes. The Suez Canal is similarly affected. It is not used by sailing-vessels engaged in Asiatic and Australian trade, all of which tonnage continues to pursue the route around the Cape of Good Hope. This matter may perhaps be put in a clearer light by stating that at an estimated cost of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

$135,000,000, with due allowance for maintenance, operation, and administration, the Nicaragua Canal tolls on a sailing-vessel of 1,000 tons would amount to $6,900, which of course would be prohibitory. In the event of the completion of the Nicaragua Canal the steamship commerce of Chili and Peru with Europe would continue to follow the route *via* the Straits of Magellan, as that route not only embraces a valuable local traffic on the eastern side of the continent at ports of Argentina, Uruguay, and Brazil, but would avoid the detention due to the slow passage through the Canal, as well as the payment of tolls.

There is a physical characteristic of the American continent which will also tend to sharply limit the amount of trans-Isthmian traffic, namely the Andean range, which skirts the western shore of South America. The oceanic divide is also near the western coast of Central America and Mexico. Commerce will never move west over that mountain range, and afterward come east through any trans-Isthmian canal. That is beyond all doubt.

One of the vagaries of the Nicaragua project consists in comparing its assumed commercial possibilities with those of the Suez Canal. From every practical point of view the comparison is absurd. The Suez route is a sea-level canal, whereas the Nicaragua scheme would involve the construction of 220 feet of lockage. The Suez Canal connects great commercial countries at either end, whereas the Nicaragua Canal would connect two vast unproductive oceans. The Suez waterway is in the direct line of great commercial currents, whereas the Nicaragua route is out of the direct line of any great commercial current. But the most important condition which distinguishes the Suez Canal from the Nicaragua project is that the former has no railroad competitor and is the highway of all the commerce which it develops; whereas the Nicaragua Canal, if constructed, would, by the time of its completion, have thirteen sharp railroad competitors between Chili at the south and British America at the north. These are: the trans-Andean railway extending from Valparaiso to Buenos Ayres; the Panama and Costa Rica railroads; the railway now in course of construction in Nicaragua from Corinto on the Pacific to a point on the Bluefields River; a railroad being constructed from old Guatemala on the Pacific to a port on the Bay of Honduras; the Tehuantepec Railway in Mexico; six transcontinental lines in the United States, and the Canadian Pacific Railway in British America. It is clearly demonstrable that each of these transcontinental railroads, measured by quantity or value of its traffic, is or will become a more important high-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

way of commerce than the Nicaragua Canal if it were now completed. Each will also deflect commerce from the Canal. About all the passenger traffic, all the express goods, and all the higher classed freights will go to the railroads, leaving to the competition of the water line only freights of the lower classes, on which railroad rates now closely approximate those charged for water carriage.

The construction of the several transcontinental railroads in the United States has, for all time, diverted a large amount of traffic from the Isthmus route. The Auditor of the Custom House at New York states that the value of merchandise shipped from New York to San Francisco, and from San Francisco to New York, by way of Panama, fell from $70,202,029 in 1869 to $3,517,582 in 1894. At the same time the tonnage transported by transcontinental railroads has increased more than tenfold, and the average rail rates have fallen from $2.60 in 1872 to 84 cents in 1894. It is clearly proven by commercial statistics that the tonnage available for the Nicaragua Canal is less now than it was five years ago, still less than it was ten years ago, and also less than it was in 1865 or even in 1850. And it will be still less ten years hence.

The chief markets for the fruit products of our Pacific Coast States are in this country, east of the Rocky Mountains. The rail shipments of green fruit from California increased from 2,896,530 pounds in 1873 to 149,040,480 pounds in 1893. Approximately, the total value of the products of California shipped east during the year 1890 amounted to about $82,000,000, of which 98 per cent was shipped by rail, the remaining 2 per cent taking the Panama and the Cape Horn routes. The conditions of distance, facilities for distribution, and time, forbid that such shipments by rail shall ever be diverted to any Isthmian canal route. There is no other State in the Union which to-day has so extensive or so promising a home market as California. Her fruits —green, dried, and preserved—are now exposed for sale in every town and village from Maine to the Rocky Mountains. The railroads engaged in this great and rapidly growing branch of our internal commerce are in close alliance with California producers,—transcontinental railroad rates on oranges, lemons, and other green fruits having been reduced from $2.50 per 100 pounds in 1873 to $1.25 in 1895; on dried fruit from $2.25 in 1873 to 60 cents in 1894 and 1895, and on wine from $2.00 in 1873 to 40 cents in 1895. The transcontinental railroad companies have even gone so far as to ask of the Interstate Commerce Commission permission to haul the fruit products of California to the Atlantic seaboard for less than the rates charged to the interior, in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

order to enable California producers to meet the competition of foreign growers in our seaboard markets; and it is gratifying to know that this form of protection to an American industry against foreign competition has been granted by the Commission.

I come now to the consideration of certain assumptions upon which the promoters and advocates of the Nicaragua Canal scheme mainly base their contention. One of these assumptions is that a large proportion of the commerce of Asia and Australia with Europe and the United States would be deflected from the Suez to the Nicaragua route. This proposition is an affront to the intelligence of the age. Comparing the distances by the two routes from Liverpool to Calcutta, Hong Kong, Yokohama, and Melbourne, we find the distances by the Suez route to be less than by the Nicaragua route as follows: to Calcutta 9,334 miles; to Hong Kong 4,222 miles; to Yokohama 872 miles; to Melbourne 1,638 miles. This, in view of the enormous tonnage of the Suez Canal, its much lower tolls, and the superior facilities of that route for coaling, proves beyond question that not a ton of shipping engaged in the commerce of Europe with Asia and Australia can possibly be diverted from the Suez route.

The distance from New York to Calcutta is less by way of the Suez Canal than by the American Isthmus route, by about 4,853 miles, and of course the former will continue to be the route for steam-vessels engaged in this trade, sailing-vessels taking the ocean passage around the Cape of Good Hope.

The distance from New York to Hong Kong *via* Suez is 11,796 miles, while that by way of the Isthmus of Panama is 11,238 miles, an advantage of 558 miles in favor of the American Isthmus; but the superior coaling facilities are largely in favor of the Suez Canal route, with its conveniently established depots at Nagasaki, Singapore, Galle, Colombo, Perim, Aden, Port Said, Malta, Algiers, and Gibraltar. On the other hand the vast Pacific Ocean, with inadequate coaling-stations, presents an almost insuperable obstacle to Asiatic commerce with the Atlantic seaports of the United States by the Nicaragua Canal route.

The distance from New York to Yokohama is 3,705 miles in favor of the American Canal route, but San Francisco is the natural entrepot of commerce with China and Japan. The imports from these countries are chiefly raw silk and tea, both of which products will in all probability, in the future, be largely shipped from San Francisco to the interior, and even as far east as New York, by rail.

Melbourne is nearer to New York *via* the American Isthmus than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

via Suez by 2,902 miles, but it has a comparatively small trade with the United States, and the alternative routes by Cape Horn and by the Cape of Good Hope seem to shut this trade off from the Nicaragua Canal. Besides, it appears to be a trade which will naturally centre at San Francisco, and thus avoid the Nicaragua route.

In view of the constant reduction of railroad rates, the improvement in the facilities for the carriage and distribution of merchandise by rail, the diversion of traffic from the Cape Horn and the Panama routes to the transcontinental lines, and the enormous development of transcontinental traffic, it is much more likely that the entire China and Japan trade of the United States will be diverted to San Francisco, and other Pacific Coast ports, and then east by rail, than that it will ever be diverted to the Nicaragua Canal route.

I have recently submitted to leading ship-brokers and shipping merchants in the city of New York, the question as to the possibility of diverting the trade of Asia or Australia to the Nicaraguan Canal, and their answers to my inquiry expose the absurdity of the proposition. Besides all this, a gross misapprehension exists as to the magnitude of the tonnage employed in the trade of the Atlantic and Gulf seaports of the United States with China, Japan, Australia, and Oceania, which might find a shorter route by the Nicaragua Canal than by Suez. During the year ended June 30, 1895, the total tonnage thus entered and cleared amounted to only 416,152 tons, of which only 53,719 tons were steam tonnage, or a possible part of the tonnage of the Nicaragua Canal. The whole of it would not sufficiently increase the possible tonnage of the Nicaragua Canal from other sources to make it in a commercial sense a practicable route.

A second assumption upon which the hopes of the promoters of the Nicaragua Canal are based is that the trade of the Pacific Coast States with Europe will be deflected to that route. The tonnage of vessels entered at and cleared from the ports of the Pacific Coast States in the trade with the countries of Europe for the year ended June 30, 1895, was as follows:

To and from Washington	80,577 tons
" " " Oregon	45,809 "
" " " California	502,349 "
Total	628,735 "

Of this total of 628,735 tons of shipping, all of which pursued the route around Cape Horn, only 5,729 tons consisted of steam tonnage, the rest being sailing tonnage. But, as already shown, sailing tonnage

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cannot pursue the Nicaragua Canal route, for the reason that, at both ends, it is in a region of calms. The advocates of the Nicaragua Canal, however, jump to the conclusion that this entire sailing tonnage, chiefly employed in the transportation of breadstuffs to Europe, would speedily give place to steam tonnage which would pass through the Canal. This is exceedingly improbable, not only on account of the tolls which it would be necessary to charge by that route, but for economic reasons affecting the combined voyages usually pursued by sailing-vessels in circumnavigating the globe. There are, besides, two other reasons which seem to forbid that such diversion to the Canal shall take place. First, it is much more probable that the present traffic around Cape Horn in the sailing-vessels will be diverted to an overland traffic by rail to Galveston or New Orleans, and thence to Europe in sailing- or steam-vessels, than that such traffic will be diverted to steam-vessels making the voyage direct from the Pacific Coast to Europe through the Nicaragua Canal. The economies of transportation sustain this view. Second, the exportation of wheat from the United States to the fluctuating markets of Europe is falling off in consequence of the competition of Argentina and other cheap wheat-producing countries, and it appears probable that a constantly increasing home market will ere long become almost the sole dependence of the American wheat-raiser.

I cannot at this time enter upon the consideration of the matters of detail and the computations which develop clearly the force of the foregoing observations. It appears to be sufficient in this connection to recommend that the Government, through its competent commercial and economic agencies, shall have such investigations and computations made for the information of Congress and the country. It would be discreditable to the intelligence of this nation to neglect to make such inquiry, and blindly rush to the conclusion that the present commerce of the Pacific Coast with Europe will be diverted to the Nicaragua Canal if it shall be constructed. New conditions confront us, and they must be studied and their lessons heeded.

A third assumption upon which the advocates of the Nicaragua Canal rest their hopes is that the shipment of lumber and timber of Oregon and Washington to the States east of the Rocky Mountains will afford ample tonnage for the Nicaragua Canal route. This assumes that such lumber is to be shipped in steam-vessels, as the Nicaragua route is not available for sailing-vessels. The impracticability of this proposition is evident from the following consideration: Draw

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a line from Buffalo, N. Y., to Pittsburgh, Pa., thence to Parkersburg, W. Va., thence to Chattanooga, Tenn., and thence in a southwesterly direction to the Rio Grande. It is easily demonstrable that lumber and timber can be transported by rail from the Pacific Coast to all points west and north of this line at a lower rate than by the ocean route in steamers by way of the Nicaragua Canal. The rail lines can ship forest products direct from the mills of the Pacific Coast to a thousand lumber-yards east of the Rocky Mountains. On the other hand the Nicaragua route would involve the additional expenses due to local rail rates to the ship, transfer from car to ship, ocean freight, canal tolls, transfer from ship to car on the eastern side of the continent, and local rail rates thence to destination. Again, to all points east of the imaginary line mentioned, the lumber of the Pacific Coast would meet the competition of the lumber of Canada, Maine, New York, Pennsylvania, and of the South Atlantic and Gulf States, including Texas. Already shingles have been shipped from the State of Washington to Boston by rail. The total tonnage employed between San Francisco and Atlantic ports of the United States in the voyage around Cape Horn amounted to only 58,015 tons during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895. This is a sailing-vessel trade. It can never be deflected to the Nicaragua Canal. Besides, it will probably soon disappear before the competition of the transcontinental railroads.

There is a fourth vain assumption upon which the hopes of the advocates of the Nicaragua Canal are based, namely, that the present tonnage of the Panama Railroad will at once be transferred to the Nicaragua Canal upon its completion. Such tonnage is largely composed of traffic to and from points in Central America and South America. Counting arrivals and departures at Panama, it amounts to about 500,000 tons annually. But as the Panama route is an established route with a large fighting margin in any competitive struggle which might ensue, the deflection of even 100,000 tons of shipping from that route seems to be improbable.

The success of a chimera oft-times depends upon the adroit use of some alluring phrase. Recourse has been had to such an expedient in the advocacy of the Nicaragua project. It has been proclaimed from one end of this land to the other that the Nicaragua Canal would form an avenue for "the commerce of the globe," just as the Suez Canal is assumed to be an avenue for "the commerce of the globe." This is transparent nonsense. The tonnage of merchandise transported on the railroads of the United States during the year 1893 amounted to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

757,464,480 tons; the tonnage of vessels which passed through the Detroit River during the year 1894 amounted to 23,091,000 tons; and the tonnage of the Suez Canal during the year 1894 amounted to 8,039,105 tons. But the traffic of the railroads of the United States constitutes only a part of the "commerce of the globe"; the traffic of the Detroit River is a much smaller part; the traffic of the Suez Canal is a still smaller fraction; and the commerce of the Nicaragua Canal would be only a small fraction of this small fraction of the "commerce of the globe." And yet this phrase has been and is to-day employed to foist upon the Government of the United States the enormous expense of constructing the Nicaragua Canal,—one of the flimsiest chimeras that ever gained human credence and patronage.

There are two practical methods of computing the amount of tonnage likely to pass through the proposed Canal. The first of these methods is based upon the official statistics of tonnage of the commercial nations, as modified by distance, nautical considerations, and various conditions affecting the course of commerce. This is the method which was employed in preparing my report of August 7, 1880, before referred to. The result then reached—1,625,000 tons—has been subjected to the tests of fifteen years of subsequent experience, and it has been found that the amount should be reduced to at least 1,000,000 tons. This is as near as the tonnage of the proposed route is susceptible of computation by that particular method, throwing doubtful questions in favor of the Canal. There is, however, another method of computation which is more direct, and also susceptible of a closer result as to what the Canal could actually realize. This method consists in taking the tonnage employed in the present Panama transit, and adding to, or subtracting from that amount, as commercial and other conditions appear to render necessary. As already stated, the tonnage of shipping entered at and cleared from Panama annually amounts to about 500,000 tons, which is less than the tonnage of the Champlain Canal in the State of New York. Considering fairly the nautical, physico-geographical, and commercial conditions already mentioned, it is altogether improbable that this amount of tonnage could be exceeded on the Nicaragua Canal. This is clear from the bare fact that the future development of commerce on the western coast of South America, of Central America, and of North America, will, as already indicated, be deflected to railroads now completed, in course of construction, or which may hereafter be built.

The cost of constructing the Canal, according to the recent estimate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Nicaragua Canal Board, is in round numbers $135,000,000. Four per cent interest on that amount is $5,400,000. To this must be added cost of maintenance, operation, and administration. This can only be estimated. The cost of maintenance, operation, and administration of the Suez Canal in 1892 amounted to $1,431,334. The Suez waterway is a sea-level canal, whereas the Nicaragua route would have 220 feet of lockage. This and other facts render it probable that the cost of maintenance, operation, and administration of the Nicaragua Canal would amount to at least $1,500,000 a year. Adding this to the interest charge of $5,400,000, we have a total fixed annual charge of $6,900,000. The toll which it would be necessary to charge in order to realize this amount would be: For 1,000,000 tons per annum —$6.90 per ton toll; for 500,000 tons per annum—$13.80 per ton toll. But the present rate of toll on the Suez Canal is only $1.87 per ton. The difference between this and the higher rate of toll by the Nicaragua Canal, above stated, is $5.03 per ton, which on a steamer of 3,000 tons burthen would amount to $15,090. The effect this would have upon the Nicaragua scheme is apparent.

It is a well-known fact that the actual cost of hydraulic work usually exceeds preliminary estimates as to its cost. It is probable, therefore, that the actual cost of the Nicaragua Canal might amount to fully $200,000,000, the amount for which, several years ago, the company contracted for its building. The present cost of the Panama Railroad transfer is about $8.72 per ton, including freight charges and all incidental expenses. Surely the Panama Railroad is not going to surrender its traffic, or any part thereof, without a sharp fight. In view of all the facts in the case, if called upon to make an estimate as to the tonnage of the proposed Nicaragua Canal for a corporation proposing to build it upon business principles, I would not advise that the enterprise should be based upon an assumption of more than 300,000 tons of shipping annually.

A glaring fault which characterizes the entire voluminous Nicaragua Canal literature is that it avoids all quantitative tests as to the magnitude of commercial movements, and all reference to the attractive power of competing routes, as well as to conditions which place limitations upon the traffic which the proposed Canal can secure. No fair-minded reader of this literature can fail to observe this fatal defect,—at least when it is once pointed out to him.

It is maintained by the proponents of the Canal that it would tend to secure valuable commercial relations with the countries of Cen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tral and South America, and thus promote those political relationships which have recently had such intense expression in the enunciation of the Monroe Doctrine. This is one of the most visionary of all the conjectural merits of the scheme. It is absurd upon its very face. The assumed political importance of the Nicaraguan Canal is clearly illustrated by the fact that the people and Government of Nicaragua are at the present moment much more deeply interested in the railroad system—which, when completed, will connect the western and central portions of that country with the excellent harbor of Bluefields on the eastern or commercial side of the continent,—than they are in the proposed Nicaragua Canal. In this they are sustained by the geographical and commercial characteristics of their country and by the economic conditions governing the two modes of transportation. Unless I am greatly deceived by information believed to be reliable, the reception which the recent Nicaragua Canal Commission met at the hands of the authorities of Nicaragua was cool almost to the point of disdain. I also have it from a competent and perfectly reliable source of information that the people and Government of Costa Rica view the Nicaragua Canal project with almost absolute indifference, notwithstanding the fact that the line of the proposed Canal skirts the northern border of Costa Rica. The resources of that country are now being rapidly developed by means of a railroad system, having Port Limon on the Caribbean Sea for its commercial outlet. Nicaragua and Costa Rica would really derive very little, if any, commercial advantage from the construction of the Nicaragua Canal. For all political purposes to be secured, the money spent in its construction might as well be sunk in the sea. On the other hand it is evident that the closest possible commercial and political relationships with the countries to the south of us on this continent will ultimately be secured through the construction of the proposed Intercontinental Railway, the preliminary surveys for which, under the auspices of the several American Governments, have already been made from the southern border line of Mexico to Cuzco in Peru. When this great railroad enterprise shall have been completed, all the transcontinental railroads of Mexico, Central America, and South America will become tributary to its traffic. The important commercial and political objects which this international bond of union will subserve are apparent. The money which it is proposed to expend in the construction of the impracticable and absurd Nicaragua Canal across a country which fails to appreciate its importance, would go far toward

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the construction of the Intercontinental Railway. Such an achievement would fittingly commemorate the closing years of this century, and perhaps herald a grander progress with the dawn of the twentieth century.

One of the arguments urged in favor of the construction of the Nicaragua Canal by the aid of the Government of the United States is that based upon its assumed military importance. The foreign nation holding the Nicaragua Canal in time of any war in which the United States were a party would be at a disadvantage from a military point of view. Not only would such occupant be obliged to maintain on a foreign soil, at great expense, defensive works from one end of the line to the other, against the dynamiter who single-handed could wreck the canal at a hundred vulnerable points, but he would be obliged also to maintain, at enormous cost, military works and naval forces for the protection of the artificial harbors at either end. In such case the United States could at any time, with the aid of an overwhelming fleet of war-ships, place obstructions, which would require months for their removal, at the entrance of either of such harbors. The cost of such offensive operations would be trifling in comparison with the cost of the defensive works maintained by the enemy. If, on the other hand, the United States should hold the Nicaragua Canal in time of war, this disadvantage of defensive measures would devolve upon it. It requires a stretch of the imagination to convert into "a Gibraltar," a canal 200 feet wide, with an artificial harbor at each end which could be plugged up in a single night. The barrier interposed by the Isthmus, in connection with the advantage which the United States now possesses in the ability to move men and material of war across the continent by rail, appears to fulfil every practical requirement of military exigency; for the assumed military disadvantage of the route around Cape Horn in time of war would be greater to a European nation than to the United States. Besides, let it be noted that a Nicaraguan Canal adequately defended and capable of accommodating great battle-ships would probably cost at least $400,000,000. If the United States should, however, contemplate the construction of the Nicaragua Canal, it is evident that, before entering upon the work, it should first submit the question to a military board selected from among our most competent army and naval officers. The possible waste of $200,000,000 on a commercial canal would be bad enough, without the added folly of a military occupation costing perhaps $400,000,000, and in line with the strategic conceptions of *Don Quixote*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An attempt is being made to prove that British capitalists now engaged in the construction of railroads in Nicaragua are trying to secure the abrogation of the concession granted by the Government of Nicaragua to the Nicaragua Canal Company, and to secure it themselves; in which event it is declared that the British Government will aid those capitalists in the construction of the Canal. This is a *canard*. British capital will never be sunk in any such absurd enterprise. The only conceivable object of the British capitalists mentioned is to cause the abandonment of the Canal in order to remove a possible obstacle to their railroad system, which will gather traffic from the west coast of Nicaragua and haul it to the eastern or commercial side of the country at the excellent port of Bluefields.

In conclusion, it appears to be neither erroneous nor uncharitable to assert that from the beginning the promoters and advocates of the Nicaragua Canal have studiously avoided anything like a thorough discussion of the economic and commercial conditions which determine the practicability of their enterprise. A pamphlet recently prepared for the Atlanta Exposition declares that the Canal would have a traffic of 8,000,000 tons annually, but fails to furnish any evidence whatever that it could secure even one twentieth of that amount,—and it is very doubtful if it could. Congress is now being urged to extend the credit of the Government to the impecunious Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua to the full amount of the cost of their project, estimated at $135,000,000, with a strong probability that it will amount to $200,000,000. Nothing could be more absurd than that the expense of such a project should be assumed by the United States Government without first causing a thorough investigation to be made as to its commercial, political, and military importance. It would be sheer madness for Congress to embark this country in such an undertaking without first ordering a new and thorough investigation of the project in all its bearings. I have therefore made an earnest request of the proper authorities that my official report of 1880, and all the statements of fact embraced in this article, may be subjected to a rigid criticism and revision by the Government and I earnestly hope that the advocates of the Nicaragua Canal project will exhibit their faith and courage by joining in this request.

JOSEPH NIMMO, JR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ARMY AS A CAREER.

A SHORT time ago I opened a volume of "Military Gazettes" issued in New York in 1860–61, and, turning over the leaves while thinking of the army as affording a career for young men, caught sight of Carlyle's caricature of the army's business.

After his soldiers, French and British, in a supposed battle, had "blown the souls out of one another," Carlyle asked significantly:

> "Had these men any quarrel? Busy as the Devil is, not the smallest! They lived far enough apart; were the entirest strangers; nay, in so wide a universe, there was even, unconsciously, by Commerce, some mutual helpfulness between them. How then? Simpleton! their governors had fallen out, and, instead of shooting one another, had the cunning to make these poor blockheads shoot."

This paragraph—an epitome, in the concrete form, of the arguments of non-resistants, or, as I like to call them, "extreme peace men"—determined me in the outset to attempt a brief discussion of the rightness of the career itself.

I.—THE RIGHTNESS OF THE CAREER.

The object of an army in the United States is not necessarily, in the main, to conduct campaigns and fight battles, nor to take human life. As the city police must watch over the city and guard it against all sorts of danger, being ready, with its weapons of offence or defence, to strike when other devices fail, so our army watches against certain dangers to the Republic, giving nerve and strength to the Executive,—helping to restrain wild Indians, to capture mistaken hordes of tramps, or to quiet mob-violence aimed against the common weal, or, with naval help, to hold back a public enemy; but ready, of course, like the effective city police, to strike at command, when the Commander-in-Chief, with the sovereign nation behind him, has come to the last resort of human expedients for guarding the nation's life or its honor.

A few months ago, in a large gathering of strong men and devout women, there was a public discussion of this question: "Is war itself ever right?" The argument of all those who answered, "War is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

never right," took this positive form: "War is wrong; wrong in itself; therefore the support given to it by praises of its deeds and pæans to its heroes, by public reminders of its glory and its victories, and by enduring monuments raised in its honor,—calculated as they are to beget and foster a wrong spirit in the minds of the people, especially of the young,—is deceptive and injurious, and tends to block the wheels of genuine progress." We will not hesitate to look this objection to war squarely in the face. Indeed, it will not do, even in self-justification, to uphold a wrong principle. Soon or late the right is bound to prevail.

Jonathan Dymond, an English writer, long ago put his postulates against all war with at least great clearness. He asserts:

"No one pretends to applaud the morals of an army, and for its religion, few think of it at all. A soldier is depraved even to a proverb. The fact is too notorious to be insisted upon, that thousands who had filled their stations in life with propriety, and been virtuous from principle, have lost, by a military life, both the practice and the regard of morality; and, when they have become habituated to the vices of war, have laughed at their honest and plodding brethren who are still spiritless enough for virtue or stupid enough for piety."

Even the dauntless John Knox condenses his censures thus:

"It happens, unfortunately, that profligacy, libertinism, and infidelity are thought by weaker minds almost as necessary a part of a soldier's uniform as his shoulder-knot. To hesitate at an oath, to decline intoxication, to profess a regard for religion, would be almost as ignominious as to refuse a challenge."

Just fifty years ago in Boston, on the 4th of July, which he denominated the "Sabbath of the Nation," Charles Sumner gave a public oration, taking as his subject "The True Grandeur of Nations." Concerning this effort Sumner said: "Men seldom make more than one exhaustive speech; the others become more or less modifications of it: that on 'The Grandeur of Nations' was my speech." Indeed, none more ornate is recorded of Clay; and Webster does not excel some portions of this in strength of statement or in grandeur of style. Were it not possible to appeal from Sumner's utterances made in peace times to Sumner himself when adding sinews to a gigantic war, I would hardly venture to quote him. Near the beginning of his oration he asked: "Can there be in our age any peace that is not honorable, any war that is not dishonorable?" He proceeded:

"The true honor of a nation is conspicuous only in deeds of justice and beneficence, securing and advancing human happiness. In the clear eye of that Christian judgment which must yet prevail, vain are the victories of war, in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

famous its spoils. He is the benefactor, and worthy of honor, who carries comfort to wretchedness, dries the tears of sorrow, relieves the unfortunate, feeds the hungry, clothes the naked, does justice, enlightens the ignorant, unfastens the fetters of the slave, and finally, by virtuous genius, in art, literature, science, enlivens and exalts the hours of life, or, by generous example, inspires a love for God and man. This is the Christian hero; this is the man of honor in a Christian land. He is no benefactor, nor worthy of honor, whatever his worldly renown, whose life is absorbed in feats of brute force, who renounces the great law of Christian brotherhood, whose vocation is blood. Well may the modern poet exclaim: 'The world knows nothing of its greatest men'!—for, thus far, it has chiefly honored the violent brood of Battle, armed men springing up from the Dragon's teeth sown by Hate, and cared little for the truly good men, children of Love, guiltless of their country's blood, whose steps on earth are noiseless as an angel's wing."

Sumner's picture of the social fostering of the war spirit is this:

"The mother, rocking the infant on her knee, stamps the images of war upon his tender mind, at that age more impressible than wax; she nurses his slumber with its music, pleases his waking hours with its stories, and selects for his playthings the plume and the sword. . . . And when the youth becomes a man, his country invites his service in war, and holds before his bewildered imagination the prizes of worldly honor. . . . Peaceful citizens volunteer to appear as soldiers, and affect, in dress, arms, and deportment, what is called the 'pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war.'"

Now, the principle underlying Sumner's graphic phrases, the real basis of his argument against war, is thus stated:

"If it is wrong and inglorious when individuals consent and agree to determine their petty controversies by combat, it must be equally wrong and inglorious when nations consent and agree to determine their vaster controversies by combat."

Notice that, by this comparison, war is shown as the fault of nations. Is all this true? Must the soldier blush to wear his uniform, hide his battle-flag, and strive to forget the names of the engagements in which, in defence of his country's integrity, he participated? Must his halting gait and battle-scarred body be regarded as a pitiable deformity, and his children be taught to reckon him with robbers and assassins? Unquestionably not. In opposition to peace-at-any-price advocates, it is not necessary to assert that war is right. War is a contest—the final arbitrament, according to the best existing national agreement—between nations or states, or between parts of the same nation or state, waged for various causes. It is sometimes right and sometimes wrong. One party to the controversy may be right, and the other wrong; or each party may be partly right and partly wrong.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The taking of human life is not necessarily opposed to Moses's law, which our Lord more strongly restated, viz.: "Thou shalt not avenge nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The history of the Israelites in peace and war shows its interpretation. All the law and practice always justified the taking of life in self-defence. A man without guilt might strike the nocturnal robber or assassin. Life was forfeited to the government for many crimes. To Joshua, a princely leader, the same Jehovah who gave the law entrusted a mighty army to seize and possess the Land of Promise. Behold his commission: "Be strong and of good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed: for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest."

The rule is that law must have force behind it for its execution. It is common sense to see that a government, to defend its life, may institute a *posse comitatus*, a police force, an army, a navy, or bodies of militia. Criminal classes, and nations influenced by gross ambition and greed, can be restrained only by a proper force from crushing out the life of a government that stands in their way. Bring Mr. Sumner to the witness-stand again—in war time. On the floor of the Senate, on the 19th of May, 1862, he said:

> "Harsh and repulsive as these rights [of war] unquestionably are, they are derived from the over-ruling, instinctive law of self-defence, which is common to nations as to individuals. Every community having the form and character of sovereignty has a right to national life, and, in defence of such life, it may put forth all its energies. Any other principle would leave it the wretched prey of wicked men abroad or at home."

That was Charles Sumner's maturer thought, wrought out in the furnace of our fearful struggle for national existence. All lovers of their kind will utter a glad amen as he adds—doubtless half in reminiscence—the following noble words:

> "I rejoice to believe that civilization has already done much to mitigate the rights of war, and it is among long-cherished visions, which even present events cannot make me renounce, that the time will yet come when all these rights will be further softened to the mood of permanent peace."

When Turks shall be effectually restrained from cruelty and barbarism, and when Japan and China shall be fully taken into the family of civilized nations, Sumner's vision of permanent peace will be nearer to fulfilment. Meanwhile, practical statesmen will consider our army and navy, including our National Guard, as much a necessity as the courts of our land. When all men actually reach the plane of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

right-doing, surely the criminal courts can be abolished. For the present, then, let peace-loving men, *a priori*, give no dishonor to the public police, to army, navy, or court.

II.—The Army as it Is.

Neither John Knox of Scotland, Jonathan Dymond of England, nor the extreme peace men of our own land, have given fair portraitures of our American soldiery. What we call regulars are really *bona fide* volunteers. Should the reader be desirous of studying the organization of our small army as it is to-day on a peace establishment, he will find all desired information in the Revised Statutes of the United States, commencing "Title XIV, the Army"; while the plan upon which the military arm is at present constructed is set forth in the table on the opposite page.

Section 1115 of the above-mentioned title declares: "There shall not be in the army at one time more than 30,000 enlisted men." This number is varied from time to time by the appropriations of Congress. Able officers have often estimated the number of men that could be brought into the field in case of sudden emergency, without injuring or sacrificing the public property which the army should protect. With an establishment of 20,000, about one-half would be available; with 30,000, two-thirds could be called out.

The main army career is found in what is usually styled the rank and file; that is, with the soldiers who have come into the service by enlistment. The largest proportion of our young men who desire to enter the military profession must come in by this door-way, for in the army, staff and line, less than 3,000 commissioned officers are allowed by law. Heretofore the term of service for the soldier has been five years. This rule was modified a few years ago, allowing him to purchase his discharge upon certain fixed conditions: but the last Congress swept away all conditions and fixed the period of enlistment at the short term of three years.

A recruit must be "effective and able-bodied." He must be sixteen years of age or over, but under thirty-five. If under twenty-one he requires the consent of parents or guardians. Other prohibitions of law forbid the enlistment of minors under sixteen years of age, insane persons, deserters from the army, and persons who have been convicted of "any criminal offence." For a second term there is the requirement that "service during his last preceding term of enlistment be honest and faithful." As a matter of fact, in recent regimental recruiting in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

	Principal Musicians	Saddler Sergeants	Chief Trumpeters	Ordnance Sergeants	Post Q.-M. Sergeants	Commissary Sergeants	Hospital Stewards	Acting Stewards	Battalion Sergeant-Major	Battalion Q.-M. Sergeant	First Sergeants	Sergeants	Corporals	Trumpeters	Musicians	Farriers and Blacksmiths	Artificers	Saddlers	Wagoners	Privates, First Class	Privates, Second Class	Privates, Hospital Corps	Privates	Total Commissioned	Total Enlisted	Military Academy		Aggregate
																										Professors	Cadets	
General Officers																								9				9
Adjutant-General's Dept.																								17				17
Inspector-General's Dept.																								7				7
Judge-Advocate-General's Department																								8				8
Quartermaster's Dept					80							7	8										102	58	197			255
Subsistence Department						120																		26	120			146
Medical Department							118	71														563		182	752			934
Corps of Engineers									1	1		40	40		8					204	206			120	500			620
Ordnance Deptartment				110								54	74							230	127			57	595			652
Signal Corps												50												10	50			60
Pension Records																								1				1
Post-Chaplains																								30				30
Pay Department																								31				31
10 Regiments of Cavalry		10	10								100	500	400	200		200		100	100				4,400	432	6,050			6,482
5 " " Artillery	10										60	260	240		120		120		60				3,090	280	3,975			4,255
25 " " Infantry	50										200	800	800		400		400		200				10,000	877	12,925			13,802
Military Academy																										8	371	379
Enlisted Men unattached to Regiments											1	13	12	1	35	1		1					232		296			
Indian Soldiers											3	24	18	5	4	7	3	2	5				174		245			245
Indian Scouts																							47		47			47
Aggregate	60	10	10	110	80	120	118	71	1	1	364	1,748	1,592	206	567	208	523	103	365	434	333	563	18,045	2,145	25,000	8	371	28,276
Retired Officers																								623		1		624
Retired Enlisted Men	4	7	4	113	7	45	37				73	260	96	6	7	12				32	4	14	210		938			938

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the country near where a regiment has been stationed, certificates or other *bona fide* evidence of good character have been demanded of the applicant. Often as many as a hundred seekers have been turned away to get ten men who came up to present requirements to enter the lowest grade in our profession. The pay of the "private" of cavalry, artillery, and infantry is $13 a month. His allowances cover his quarters, clothing, and rations. A private of the second class in the Engineer and Ordnance corps receives just the same as the above. Here is the starting-point for every man who enlists.

As more than ordinary knowledge is sought among the qualifications of the modern soldier, on account of the intricacies of ordnance construction, especially in the case of rifles and artillery, and more individual character and responsibility are needed in the new methods of manœuvring with extended lines, the recruit is subjected to more than three times the schooling and training of years gone by. Schools and gymnasiums are maintained at every army post. The soldier very soon becomes an expert in the handling of his rifle, his field-piece, his heavy gun, his carbine, and his horse. Whole troops of cavalry now show the quickness and elasticity of which, a few years ago, a class of West Point cadets would have been proud. If capable, industrious, and obedient, the recruit will soon rise. In the Engineer and Ordnance departments, privates of the first class receive $17 a month with all the allowances. There are ordnance sergeants, first sergeants, sergeants, corporals, musicians, trumpeters, saddlers, blacksmiths, hospital stewards, hospital attendants, and artificers, of higher compensation, and men detailed to work which will entitle them to extra pay. Many are the openings which present themselves to skill and good conduct. The pay is graded from the $13 of the ordinary private up to that of the ordnance sergeant, which is primarily $34, with the usual quarters, clothing, and subsistence added; and from the third year there is an increase of one dollar a month.

The answer to the question, "Can an enlisted man gain a commission?" is found in the fact that very many of our officers, especially during the civil war, came from the ranks of the regular army, several reaching the rank of field officers in both the line and staff. The rule of promotion is thus fixed by law:

"Non-commissioned officers may, under regulations established by the Secretary of War, be examined by a board of four officers as to their qualifications for the duties of commissioned officers in the line of the army, and shall be eligible for appointment as second lieutenants in any corps of the line for which they may be found so qualified."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The number is, of course, limited by the number of vacancies which graduating cadets have failed to fill. Such second lieutenants from the ranks may, however, be attached as supernumeraries, provided the supernumeraries do not exceed one for each company.

The West Point cadet holds the next grade above the enlisted man. After his matriculation he receives a "cadet warrant" from the War Department, in lieu of a commission. His original title was a "letter of appointment" from the President. Each member of the House of Representatives has the power of nominating to the Military Academy one young man, a resident of his Congressional District, which nomination must be confirmed by the President's formal appointment. Each Territory and the District of Columbia are also entitled to the appointment of one cadet. The President himself has the privilege of appointing and continuing ten cadets. Entrance to the Academy can be obtained in no way other than the above, except by special Act of Congress. The cadet's compensation, to cover all expenses, is "$500 a year and one ration a day." As a rule the members of the upper sections of a class are, upon their entrance, already fairly well educated; many are college graduates. Formerly only about one-third could master the course of study and get their diplomas. A larger proportion now get through the Academy. The class of 1854 entered 120 strong, and graduated but 36; whereas the class of 1895 has sent out 52, probably but half of those who joined it four years ago.

All these fifty-two have been commissioned, and have probably by this time reported for orders or assignment to duty to their corps or regiments. Except the Engineer Corps, the staff departments are usually filled from the officers of the army: for the Ordnance Corps, by a severe professional examination; for the others, by selection to fill vacancies as they occur. The Engineer Corps is filled directly from a few graduates near the head of each class. The medical department, however, replenishes from young physicians by a most trying examination, and frequently the judge-advocates have been lawyers in civil practice, coming in by the President's nomination and confirmed by the Senate. Paymasters have frequently been appointed from civil life with the rank of major. Thus commences the commissioned officer's army career. The lowest pay—that of the second lieutenant of infantry—is $1,500 a year, with the common provision of medical attendance, fuel, and quarters. Before the second lieutenant are the grades of first lieutenant, captain, major, lieutenant-colonel, colonel, brigadier-general, and major-general. But three major-generals are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

allowed by law, and their pay is $7,500 a year, with allowances for horses and fuel, and provision for medical service and quarters. A second lieutenant on the peace footing can hardly look for much promotion—in process of time a captaincy, possibly a majority in line or staff—before the sixty-four-year law shall retire him.

Methinks an enterprising youth would hardly remain in the army simply for money or promotion.

The duties of army officers are many and varied. The Engineers are distributed over the country, and see to the selection of fort-sites and the construction of works, and, together with the navy, attend to the lighting of our shores and the coast survey. They have the supervision of plans and expenditures for river and harbor improvements. They stand with our best civil engineers in everything pertaining to roads and bridges; and mines, torpedoes, shore batteries, and other defences of cities are committed into their able hands. Promotion is obtained by passing rigid examinations. The Engineer Corps is distinguished for its unflagging energy.

The Ordnance Corps is both a scientific and practice organization, whose work covers the furnishing of armaments for forts, batteries, and men. Its requirements for entrance under competition are difficult to meet. Its members have charge of the armories and arsenals of construction, and they must and do keep abreast of the world in their practical knowledge of their specialty, by hard study and constant experiment.

So we might take up the quartermaster's department, with its exacting and multifarious work; the subsistence department, with its administrative completeness; the artillery, with its post-graduate school and its scientific knowledge practically applied to its various complicated engines of warfare; the cavalry, intensely active in schools, in drill, and in mental and physical instruction; and the infantry with its target practice, new guns, new tactics, and gymnastic requirements.

One could thus continue throughout the whole organization, considering the busy surgeons, the hopeful chaplains, the studious judge-advocates, the conscientious paymasters, or the thorough, businesslike, administrative heads of geographical Departments. All would be found to compare favorably with other able and industrious men who are faithfully doing the world's work.

This is but a nucleus, yet it is the framework of a large army, and it would be a mistake to impute idleness, or time ill spent, to the majority of army officers. Except the mere campaign and battle, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peace-army has the same functions to perform as the war-army; and, in fact, as the school, academy, and college trials of mind and muscle are usually harder than the life work that follows, so are the trials of mind and muscle of the army men in the days of peace. The law requires the detail of many to the West Point, Fort Monroe, Leavenworth, and Riley schools, and to institutions of learning everywhere as instructors of the military art. For one purpose and another lieutenants are taken away from their batteries, troops, and companies by order of their seniors, and this throws the duty of discipline, drill, instruction, and command upon the few that are left with their organizations.

This is the summary: an honorable profession filled with patriotic men, devoted to duty, with hearts as warm and loyal to all the obligations of a true manhood as are found in other professions. To have a competency, to secure a good name, to defend the flag without fear and without reproach, and to discharge solemn obligations to God and to man during life, are objects above the securing of large wealth and luxurious living. This is the ambition of the best army men from the private soldier to the major-general.

OLIVER O. HOWARD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BEST THING COLLEGE DOES FOR A MAN.

"WHAT is the best thing your college did for you?" This was the question which I asked of fifty representative men, with a view to reading the answers to the men of a single college. The answers touched upon many matters which are now vitally related to American life, and represented not only conclusions which may prove of service to every teacher and student in each of our four hundred colleges, but also methods which may prove of value to a wide constituency.

It is difficult to distinguish the best thing done by a college for its students, because the good things are so many. It is easier to say that all these influences constitute an incalculable benefit, than to point out the noblest one. It is the testimony of most graduates that the college was to them a determinative influence. This testimony is supported by these letters. President Dwight says that the college made him an educated man and a man of thoughtful life. President Gilman says: "The best thing Yale College did for me was to give me training." The late Dr. Arthur Brooks said: "The best thing my college did for me was to educate me." Each thus affirms that all the influences of the college resulted in giving a certain determination or direction to life. One may assent to the words of the editor of a great newspaper, in speaking of his course at a New England college:—

> "I do not recall that a single professor in my four years' course at —— ever made an agreeable impression upon me or did anything to arouse my mind or to awaken and inspire my life."

And yet one may agree with the further sentiment of the same gentleman when he says:—

> "My career in college was the making of me. I entered a raw youth from a country academy, and I was graduated a young man who had learned how to use books, who had found out how to study, how to gather information, how to treat it, and how to think."

Senator George F. Hoar, writing of his own college (Harvard), says:—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The education there from '42 to '46 was far inferior to what can be obtained now in very humble institutions. But somehow the young men who were not good scholars and who were not industrious seemed to derive a great deal of advantage, both in the way of refinement and actual learning and moral and mental discipline, from their contact with the university."

Mr. Hamilton W. Mabie says of his college (Williams):—

"It confirmed me in my desire to lead the life of an intellectual man,—to look at things clearly, dispassionately, and in their large relations. It taught me how to study, and gave me such an impulse that I have never ceased to study. Access to books in large numbers, and a good deal of leisure, confirmed my habit of reading in a systematic and fruitful way. That habit has done more for such education as I possess than any other one thing. A college does many things specifically for a student; but the greatest thing it can do for him, in my judgment, is to confirm his highest thought of life, and to fix in him those habits which will enable him to realize that thought for himself when he gets out from under college influence."

The present president of Brown University, writing of the influence of the college over him as a student, says:—

"Brown University did so many important things for me that it is hard to single out any one of them in particular. It brought me invaluable development in character; and of course, in a sense, nothing else could equal this. Yet its help at this point was perhaps not so marked in relation to what I possessed before, as was what the college did for me in other particulars. It taught me to think logically,—by which I mean not so much the power of close and clear analysis as I do that of careful generalization, and the proper ordering of many thoughts according to their mutual relations. It gave me the ability to work at any given time, whether with mind or with body, and also the ability, on occasion, to keep up maximum application for maximum time. I count this power for hard work among the very best results of a liberal education. It gave me a working knowledge of four languages, with such insight into linguistic laws as to render the acquisition of other languages relatively easy; and, lastly, such outlook upon the fields of science, literature, and history, that I am able to 'work up' any new subject in any of these fields as I am sure I could never have done but for this training."

Thus the aggregate of the influences of the college are of tremendous importance in the constitution and direction of life.

The American college can hardly plume itself upon its contributions to scholarship. It has quickened scholarly aspirations and aroused scholarly impulses; but its efforts in extending research and in cultivating fields of knowledge belong rather to the future than to the past. We are, however, beginning to receive intimations of such efforts and of such effects. But the aim of the American college has been and is rather to make thinkers than scholars. It has preferred

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be rather a mother of men than a school of scientists. It has cultivated humanity through the humanities, rather than the scholastic humanities through the personal humanity. It has given a training in that first essential element,—of training one to think. It has, says President Angell, trained the power of making "a lucid statement of a proposition to be maintained, of carefully defining the terms in which it is stated, of making a sharp analysis by which it is to be supported, and of presenting the points in a logical order." It has also disciplined one to independence both in thinking and acting. A college president, writing of the Harvard of forty years ago, and of his own life there, says:—

"So far as I can now see, the best thing Harvard College did for me was to give me practice in thinking and acting independently in a crowd of conflicting contemporaries of various faculties and members."

This independence is akin to those qualities which may be grouped together under the word "fortitude." Fearlessness before any of the perils to which one's self or one's career is subjected represents this adequate result. A Yale graduate, Dr. Henry A. Stimson, pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York, has well indicated the nature of this training when he says:—

"At Yale I found myself in competition with the picked men of the whole country, and in the course of my college life I was called upon to enter into contest with them in every direction,—the contest of the athletic field and of the boat race no less than the contest of the class room and prize debates. As a consequence, when I entered active life outside the college and found myself matched with new men and strange experiences, the thought that I had already been in competition with the best minds of my age, and had done my part, was a source of courage and strength that proved most valuable."

The practical character of the training which a college offers is seen in no more conspicuous way than in the thought that it is a training to hard work. Laziness is a sin which besets the college as easily as it does the individual. But tens of thousands of men have received their first impulse to downright hard, persistent, and absorbing work in college, and thus laid the foundations for the best things that life can offer. Two graduates of Brown University offer significant testimony upon this point. President Andrews says:—

"The college gave me the ability to work with intensity at any given time, whether with mind or with body, and also the ability on occasion to keep up maximum occupation for a maximum time. I count this power for hard work among the very best results of a liberal education."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And President Angell adds: "The moral impulse to manly and laborious lives was probably the best thing we got from the college."

It cannot also be denied that the college presents opportunities for the acquiring of habits of dignified leisure. An Oxford Don says:—

"It is a great thing to be able to loaf well: it softens the manners and does not allow them to be fierce; and there is no place for it like the streams and gardens of an ancient university."[1]

The words of a "Mere Don" are not to be interpreted too seriously. But if the college is a good place to learn to work hard, it is also a good place to learn how to rest and to re-create one's self well.

But if the American college has been a mother of men, and if it has not been a nurse of scholarship, it has, in making men and in conveying instruction, done a work of tremendous significance. This work is partially ethical, partially religious, partially scholastic. It is a work which may be said to be embodied in the general broadening, deepening, and enriching of character. A well-known editor writes:—

"As I look back to it now, the only thing that I remember with very great definiteness, and am especially grateful for, is the general broadening influence which followed the finding out of what men had done in the world in one great department of learning after another. So that by the time I had finished my college course I had a conception more or less well proportioned of the great things the human race has achieved, and I had my curiosity aroused to learn something. Unless my memory is treacherous, I can truthfully say that I knew nothing of very much value when my college course was finished; nothing except that I had this sort of chart of the world's great work."

But the college also has done a very special work in developing character along ethical and religious lines. President Andrews succinctly remarks: "The college enlarged the range of my sympathies and my views of life, God, man, and duty, turning, as I trust, my pietism into piety." So also says Dr. Henry M. Field, in speaking of Professor Albert Hopkins: "In leading us among the stars he led us to the Creator and Ruler of all."

It is the testimony of most of these writers that of the two elements which represent so large a part of the college,—instruction and personality,—personality is by far of superior importance. When President Jordan says, "The best thing a college, as a rule, does for a young man, is to bring him into contact and under the inspiration of other men of a higher type than he is otherwise likely to meet"; and when Dr. Parkhurst says, "While books can teach, personality only can edu-

[1] "Aspects of Modern Oxford," by "A Mere Don," p. 133.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cate"; and when Professor Simon Newcomb says, "The greatest service to me was in bringing me into contact with educated men and offering me the appliances necessary to prosecute my studies"; and when Dr. Field says that "the statements of President Hopkins were as goads in the hands of a master to prick up sluggish minds"; or Mr. Henry M. Alden says, "The best thing which Williams College did for me was to bring me within the scope of Dr. Mark Hopkins's inspirational teaching,"—they are simply declaring that personality is the great power of college life. Even Senator Hoar bears out this impression when he remarks that "it was the recitations to Dr. Walker that constituted the most benefit," although the recitations were in such disciplinary subjects as Ethics and Mental Philosophy. This impression is still further emphasized by the strong words of Dr. Parkhurst:—

"I can say without an instant's hesitation that the one influence in my college life to which I owe more than to anything else was the personal pressure upon me of Prof. Julius H. Seeley, afterwards President Seeley; and I think there are a good many of my college mates that would make the same statement. I do not mean to under-rate the work done in the class room in a purely professorial capacity."

The remark is often made that students are educated as much by each other as by the professors. The influence of students over each other at Yale is especially strong. I recently asked an officer of Yale College, which had the stronger influence over the students,—the students or the professors. Prompt was the answer, "The students." Whether the answer was a true or false interpretation I do not know. Whether this ought to be the fact may be open to question. But it is clear that the attrition of different minds of the same general character upon each other is of great value. It is certainly significant that a character so strong and so individual as that of Dr. Richard Salter Storrs found its best influence in these common relations. For Dr. Storrs writes:—

"I think the best thing I found in college life was the intimate contact with fine minds of classmates. I shall never cease to be grateful for the educating influence thus received."

Dr. William Hayes Ward, too, of the "Independent" (a graduate of Amherst), says:—

"The best thing I received was the encouragement and help that came from good fellowships. I was brought into relations with other serious and earnest young men who had impulses before them to do good, and who were eager for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the acquisition of what would help them. Those associations were a support. They helped me to study in literary work and elsewhere to good purpose. I enjoyed very much my membership in college societies. By association with certain particular friends I could carry on certain scientific studies better than I could alone. I could go about the country botanizing and geologizing, and I made myself a part of the great sodality of letters, an advantage which cannot be overvalued. . . . Civilization is a product, not of isolation, but of the crowding of population, and the civilizing influence of the humanities is in good part due to the fellowships in which it is cultivated."

The influence of students is constantly recognized in respect to its less favorable aspects. But it is not so often recognized in respect to its higher and nobler relations. It is never to be forgotten that humanity educates humanity, and personality disciplines personality.

A comprehensive inference, therefore, to be derived from these letters is that the best thing which the American college has done for its graduates is in giving a training which is itself largely derived from personal relationship. It is interesting to compare the conclusions reached by these men with the answers given to a not dissimilar question by women graduates of Cornell University. A committee of their own number secured replies from fellow students upon the value of a college training in reference to their individual life. From these replies I select the following :—

"University training has given me broader opportunities and deeper sympathies."

"My experience at Cornell made this life fuller of meaning, and the beauty of the next life more sure. It has made me more certain of the goodness of God and of man ; more sympathetic ; more willing to work for others."

"The mental discipline received while at college remains with me, although I have retained but few of the facts learned there, I fear."

"Cornell has taught me right methods of work, and has given me a broader outlook on the facts of life."

"My college training gave me intellectual stimulus ; knowledge of methods of study ; appreciation of the value of all thorough work."

"My university training has been most valuable to me in its influence of general culture, in applying scientific methods to any study, and in a more comprehensive view of life."

"My university training has enabled me to investigate and to make use of any material close at hand."

"My university education has been the chief factor in my life ; it has contributed to my health and happiness, and has enabled me to support a large family with ease."

"I value my university training for giving me opportunity of contact with professors of wide culture and high attainments, as well as for the daily discipline of the class room."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"My university training afforded me general development of character and intellect, and has proven an inspiration to living."

"My university work has been valuable to me intellectually and spiritually, by enlarging my life and widening its relations; and practically by giving me the handle to my faculties."

"I value my university education most for the mental discipline which taught me how to get at what I most wanted to know."

"Cornell disciplined my mind and helped me to be a better and happier and more useful woman."

"My university training made my life broader in its sympathies, and has proven an important factor in my domestic life."

"Training at Cornell gave me systematic methods for all things."

"My whole life is wider in its sympathies and interests because of my college training. And the mental discipline I regard as a not unimportant factor in my domestic life. That I am a better cook because I am a college-bred girl is a proud boast with me."

"The greatest good that I am conscious of having derived from my college training is a broadening process, spiritual and moral, as well as mental, that has taken place in my character."

"Not only can I undertake almost any intellectual task with confidence, but I can also bear the small trials and annoyances of life with greater serenity because of the training I received at the university. In other words, it has given me a truer perspective of the importance of things."

The absence of allusions to the worth of the personality of teachers in these replies is possibly significant. I have been asking myself the question, What is its significance? Are women less open to the personal influences of a teacher than men? Such is not the accepted opinion. Are Cornell teachers less impressive than other teachers? One hesitates to credit such an intimation. Does the short period dividing the college years from the present, in the case of many of those who bear these testimonies, tend to magnify the value of instruction and to minimize the value of the instructor? An affirmative answer is hardly credible. Is the modern college depending less on personality and more on the book and the laboratory? But whatever the answer may be, I merely suggest that this absence of allusion to the worth of personality may have considerable significance.

The comparison of the American college with the English or German university brings forth an interesting contrast. The value of personality in the English university is probably greater than in the American college. The reason of this is at least twofold. The English university is not only a place of education: it is a place of society; or, as the late Professor Jowett said, in a sermon preached the first Sunday after his election as Master of Balliol, "Society may be said to be a great part of education." At any rate social relations play a most

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

important function in Oxford and Cambridge. The relation, too, between the student and his tutor in the English system is very close. The tutor often lives in as well as works for his pupil. At times it is a relation very free and easy, and again it is most vital and inspiring.[1] The late Professor Jowett was easily a great scholar, but he was more easily a master of men. The personal relations he cultivated represent the foundation of a large share of the best work he did for Oxford and for England. But in the German university the chief power over the student is derived through scholarship rather than through the personality of the teacher. Although the best of the German students may come into close relations with the German professors, and may find in the intimacy of this relation helpful influences of rare power, yet the German professor is usually eager simply to deliver his lecture, and cares less, apparently, whether his audience be one or one hundred, provided only he has done his duty in reading his manuscript or in giving his talk. But through the seminars "the personal acquaintance of the instructor with the students is brought about; wherever a really intimate relation has grown up between them, its roots will generally be found in the seminar, for it is here that the student receives individual and personal impulse, and here that the instructor sees the talents growing which shall continue his own work."[2] The American college, in respect to the best thing which it can give to its students, seems to be a union of the personality of the English professor and of the scholarship of the German university.

The consideration of this important subject suggests two or three questions.

Do the best results which a college works for its students differ according as the college is large or small, rural or urban, holding to the required or adopting the elective system of studies? The answers do not allow any induction upon these points. It may also be said that these letters were written by men who have been out of college on the average for at least twenty-five years. I venture to ask whether letters written by the men graduating to-day would bear similar testimony. I think they would. For, as President Eliot writes, the education which Harvard gave in his days as a student was inferior. It was much inferior to the education which the college gives in these days of the great president we all know. A representative student who is soon to graduate from a college has written to me as follows:—

[1] Bristed, "Five Years in an English University," pp. 190, 192, etc.
[2] Friedrich Paulsen, "The German Universities," p. 213.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"I doubt whether a man still in college is in a position to judge of the results of his college training, yet there are one or two things which seem pretty clear to me. While I have derived much benefit from the study of books, I think it has been a greater benefit to me to study men and their methods of thinking and working. But the best thing the college has done for me, so far as I know myself, has been to set before me a higher ideal of manhood than I had before. It has made me satisfied with nothing less than the best I can make out of myself, whereas before I came to college I believe I was content with less. I have come to realize the fact that no man has a right to fall behind his possibilities."

It may also be questioned whether the best results of the work of a college are to remain what they now are; for college methods and content of work are changing. Are the results also to change? The college is becoming an agency of research. It is becoming a mother of scientists. Is it to cease to be a mother of men? Or is the condition of being a mother of scientists the best condition for continuing its service as *alma mater?* Whatever may be in store for the American college as the predecessor of the American university, it can never cease to be an agency for the training of a man in the great business of living. It enriches his life; it deepens and broadens his view of truth; it ennobles his aims; its strengthens his choice of the right; it clarifies his vision of, and his love of, the beautiful. The college pours oil into the lamp of character and makes its light more radiant and more lasting. When these functions are lost, if they ever be lost, they must be assumed by some other power. For, so long as the race continues, so long are its members to be trained to think, to judge, to reason, to act with independence and with justice, to work laboriously, and to be large and true and noble men. These qualities represent the best thing which a college can do for its students.

CHARLES F. THWING.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME MUNICIPAL PROBLEMS.

THE municipal problems that have hitherto absorbed most of the energies of civic federations and good-government clubs are those of clean streets and alleys; the organization of poor-relief; an honest, efficient police force and criminal courts; enforcement and improvement of excise, criminal, and election laws; the closing of saloons on Sunday; and civil-service and public-school reform. The solution of these problems is important, and prepares the way for the equally important and more difficult questions still before us. These relate to the raising and expending of municipal revenues, and to the proper attitude of the city toward monopolies of situation, such as light, heat, and street transportation.

When we consider the increased amount of money that our cities could well afford to spend upon their streets, schools, sanitary departments, libraries, parks, and public buildings, all of which should educate the public taste as well as accommodate the public business, we must at once realize the need of much more public revenue. It is no answer to claim that there is enough revenue now if it were only honestly spent. Facts altogether disprove this. To give an instance, a committee of Chicago's best business men, after keeping a small section of that city reasonably clean during the past summer from private subscriptions, report that to clean all the streets and alleys of the city adequately, although done in the most economical manner, would require over ten times the $250,000 annually appropriated for this purpose. Yet in that city during the last eight years, owing to a deplorable undervaluation, the per-capita revenue raised by taxes for general expenditures has declined 30 per cent.

When we contrast Germany's thorough enforcement of compulsory education for every child from six to fourteen years of age, for over forty-four weeks in the year; and the admirable kindergarten, manual, and technical instruction of some foreign and even a few home cities, —all of which cost money,—with the bad conditions in these respects in the vast majority of our cities, to say nothing of contrasts in street paving and other matters, we cannot believe that more honesty and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

intelligence in the spending is all that is needed in those of our cities whose rapid growth calls for still more rapid increase of public improvements. Inasmuch as society, like an individual, can better afford to use 10 per cent of a large income or property than 5 per cent of a small one for some useful but perhaps not immediately remunerative purpose, we need not be disturbed if public revenues, provided they are honestly and wisely expended, increase faster than private income. Yet a great economic authority on this subject—Prof. Henry C. Adams—doubts if public expenditures in this country since 1840 have increased as fast as private wealth.

Not only do we need more revenue, but we need far wiser and juster methods of raising it. The recent report of the Illinois Bureau of Labor Statistics is a revelation of the extent of tax-evasion and unequal assessments. Although some States—as Pennsylvania—have a better tax system than Illinois, it can be said of nearly every city and State in the Union that their success in enforcing their tax laws is a generation behind that of western Europe. In no other governmental activities is there more room for reform than in this. The evil is naturally worst in our cities, where ability to pay taxes is most easily concealed. Many of our tax systems are actual promoters of crime. Business men of high commercial standing have told me how agents of the assessor have offered to secure reductions in their assessments if the agent might have one-half of what was saved. Such offers are often accepted.

Where assessments are notoriously unequal, it often seems to business men simply a question of justifiable self-defence to bring pressure and even bribery to bear in order to keep even with one's competitors. The great test comes when such men have an opportunity, so often unused, to help along movements intended to improve the system and remove the temptation for fraud or inequality. It may be admitted that the condition is somewhat better in smaller cities and in some eastern States, but everywhere it is bad enough. The proposal of the late able Pennsylvania Tax Conference, that every taxpayer should receive, with his assessment, a list of all the assessments in the few blocks near him, would lessen inequalities. Much might also be accomplished by the separation, as already in some States, of the sources of State and local revenue, with the creation of adequate tax courts, and the union in one tax district of the entire county where each large city is situated.

As I am writing of cities, I must avoid considering taxes on in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

comes, inheritances, and corporate property, which are more properly matters of State concern. Mayor Pingree's instruction to his Detroit assessors to assess all land, even if unoccupied, at its full selling value, and to be somewhat lenient in assessing improvements, seems to have had good results, and to point the way to at least an equal ratio of assessment in proportion to true value upon land as upon improvements.

The extent to which discriminations may appear in a city possessed of a particularly poor tax system is illustrated in the report, before cited, of the Illinois Bureau of Labor Statistics. After showing hundreds of instances, assumed to be typical, where land values in Chicago are assessed at only one-third the rate of improvements, the report gives tables showing that in the cheap-residence quarters of Chicago the building is worth 74 per cent of the total value of land and residence, while in sections devoted to choice residences and large office buildings the building is worth only 43 to 48 per cent of the entire property. Thus the high assessment on improvements, compared with the low one on land, discriminates against cheap and even fairly good residence property. It appears that the average rate of assessment on eighty pieces of cheap-residence property, worth on the average $867 each, was three times as great in proportion to true value as on ninety-eight pieces of unimproved land worth on the average $2,509 each; twice as great as on thirty pieces of choice-residence property of an average value of $140,869 each, and 75 per cent more than the rate of assessment on seventy pieces of business and office property worth on the average $1,421,479 each. As press and public have, since the first day following the publication of this report, pursued a policy of silence respecting it, but have not, to my knowledge, denied the statements therein made, their general accuracy may be accepted.

Another municipal issue of equal importance is that of franchises or special privileges in the use of streets for water, gas, electric-light, telephone, and street-railway plants. In the case of water-works, city ownership is now in the lead, and its superiority to private ownership is almost universally acknowledged in places that have tried both. Nearly two hundred cities in America now own their electric-light plants, but in most cases they are handicapped by legal inability to sell to private consumers. A comparison with most private companies is therefore impossible, for the latter will often agree to light streets at nearly cost in order thereby to secure a franchise permitting very profitable charges for commercial lighting. A company having this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

private business also gains by a public contract which pays even a small amount of the fixed charges that otherwise would have to be paid from the receipts of the commercial lighting. Yet even with full allowance for depreciation, interest at 4 to 5 per cent until a plant is paid for from net earnings, and for other items often omitted from the reports, the majority of these public plants appear to have justified their existence.

Where public plants are permitted to sell to private consumers, as at Danville, Va., not only is the charge to the consumer much reduced, but there is a large profit to the city. Chief Barrett, of the Chicago Electric-Light Department, informs me that although he is paying higher wages and working his men fewer hours (eight hours per day) than the private companies, and placing the mains in conduits in the heart of the city, he could cut in two the prices of the private companies and still make a profit, if he were only permitted to sell to private consumers.

Gas-works, street railroads, and telephones are still almost entirely in private hands in this country. The exceptions are found in the Brooklyn Bridge cable line, several fire and police telephone systems, and a dozen gas companies: the most important of the latter being those of Richmond and Danville, Va.; Wheeling, W. Va.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Hamilton, Ohio; and Henderson, Ky. These monopolies probably furnish the most profitable returns on cost of construction of any kind of business in America. It is nothing unusual to find electric street-car plants that can be duplicated with all equipment for $20,000 to $35,000 per mile of single track, and horse-car lines of less cost, earning 4 to 6 per cent on more than $100,000 capitalization. Fares which at three to four cents would return as good profit as the average cotton or woollen mill, are kept at five cents,—the same as twenty years ago,—while meantime the cost of operation and material, and the prices of all goods subject to competition, have considerably fallen. Almost as large monopoly profits are made by the gas companies of our large cities, although reductions in price occasionally occur.

Out of the enormous profits to be derived from these necessities of city life, provided favorable grants can be secured from city councils, there arise the most demoralizing conditions. A prominent attorney, upon whose word I can rely, lately remarked to me:—

"When I stop to think of the methods of some of our largest corporations, which are daily brought to my certain knowledge, I wonder where we are going to land. As merely typical of this I may say, without mentioning names, that a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

few days ago a large corporation in which I am a director set aside $100,000 to buy a certain city council the coming winter, and we did it as calmly as we would have appropriated the same to furnish a new office building."

Fortunately some editors and newspaper-owners occasionally speak out, but rarely, thus far, with the success attending the exposure of Tweed by the New York "Times."

The average wage-worker as yet sees little benefit to himself in such grants of city franchises as will bring more revenue to the city and lessen taxes, whose burden seems to him to fall on other classes, while he is repelled by the superior airs of some reformers and attracted by the promises, made by demagogues, of direct benefits to his ward or to his class. With the recent tendency of reformers to ask for cheaper and better service, rather than large payments to the city, a greater popular following is sure to come.

After a long and severe struggle, and after refusing bribes of from $50,000 to $75,000 from those claiming to represent established local monopolies, Mayor Pingree, of Detroit, Mich., has secured from a new street-car company a rate of fare by which passengers can purchase eight tickets for twenty-five cents. Under this contract the city assumes the expense of street-paving between the rails, and a few minor expenses, which practically makes each fare equivalent to about three and a half cents, in comparison with five cents (sometimes with and sometimes without obligation on the part of the company to pave part of the street) in nearly all other American cities. In Reading, Pa., thirty tickets are sold for a dollar. The Detroit Street Railway Company now offers to sell its tracks to the city at cost, pay the city a rent equivalent to interest on the investment at 3½ per cent,—at which rate it is assumed that the city can borrow,—and then, itself furnishing all equipments, to sell single tickets for three cents, and forty tickets for a dollar. It also offers to use the tracks of the other company on the same terms, if the city can secure possession of them. The old company, known as the Citizens' Street Railway Company, now offers to sell eight tickets for twenty-five cents, but single tickets for five cents when transfers are given, if a thirty-year franchise is granted.

The Third Avenue surface road of New York city recently secured at auction eleven miles of road, known as the "Kingsbridge extension," in a now thinly populated district, for 41½ per cent of the gross receipts as payment to the city for the first five years, and 43½ per cent thereafter, the fare being five cents. Unfortunately this franchise appears to have either no time limit or a very remote one.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The recent successful competitor for a new street-car franchise in Indianapolis offered not only six fares for twenty-five cents, with full transfer privileges and extensive street-paving, but a percentage of gross receipts to the city of 10 per cent the first five years, 12½ per cent the second five years, 13½ per cent the third five years, and 14½ per cent the remaining fifteen years. Last December the directors of the Chicago General Railway (electric), having sixteen miles of double track, authorized the sale of seven tickets for twenty-five cents after May 1, 1896. The payment to the city of 9 per cent of the gross receipts of all the lines in Baltimore produces a revenue of more than $200,000 a year, which is expended for the parks.

The now famous lease of the Toronto street railways, made in 1891 for thirty years, deserves a passing notice. Besides paying $800 a mile to the city for every mile of single track; providing a rate of six fares for twenty-five cents (or eight fares between 6 and 8 A.M. and from 5 to 6.30 P.M.); working its employees only ten hours a day; and submitting to other interesting conditions, the successful bidder pays 8 per cent on all gross earnings up to $1,000,000, 10 per cent on the next half million, 12 per cent on the next half million, 15 per cent on all earnings between $2,000,000 and $3,000,000, and 20 per cent on all above the last figure. Such terms, if in force in most cities, would mean not only lower fares, but more than three times the public revenue now secured from street railways. In 1892 Montreal secured from a new company as low fares as in Toronto, and about two-thirds as good a percentage of gross receipts. Yet even in Toronto the city treasurer has stated that, during the three months in which the city had charge in the summer of 1891, direct city operation proved more profitable to the city than the lease during any three months of the year or two immediately following. As Dr. Albert Shaw and others have shown, city management of street-car lines has proved a great success in many European cities. Recent returns are at hand showing the results of the first year of city management at Glasgow. They show that, aside from putting on a handsome new equipment of cars, providing the employees with uniforms, and reducing the hours of labor, the city has overcome a bitter competition from the old company, which, on failing to secure a renewal of its lease, started a great number of omnibuses. After full allowance for depreciation the city secured a much larger net revenue than during any year of its lease of the city-owned tracks to a private company.

The Brooklyn Bridge Cable Road, with its gradual and voluntary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reduction of fares to the present charge of 2½ cents, and with its great financial success, strict civil service, higher pay, and fewer hours than on the adjacent Manhattan Elevated Road, and a greater freedom from fatal accidents than is true of most private companies, sets an example of city management that is sure to spread. The entire cost of maintaining, not only the cable line but the carriage and foot ways, the ninety policemen and all other expenses of the Bridge, was only 2.13 cents per passenger by the cable road alone in 1895. The trouble with private ownership of these comparatively simple routine-like city monopolies lies in the antagonism of interest between city and company, and the enormous temptation, already dwelt upon, to weaken, if not corrupt, councils or commissions appointed to guard the public rights. It seems far harder to introduce honest and efficient regulation of private-owned city monopolies than it is to introduce the civil-service reform that should accompany city ownership and management. In attacking the spoils system we are attacking a set of usually disreputable politicians, whom most decent citizens despise; while in seeking to secure honest dealings between a public body and a private city monopoly we often have to contend with the so-called "best citizens," whose power is enormous, and whose selfish interests are opposed to reform.

We may well pause over a situation such as that described by Mayor Swift of Chicago in the following burning words to the wealthy Commercial Club of that city, December 28, 1895, as reported in the Chicago "Tribune" of the next morning:—

"Talk about anarchy; talk about breeding the spirit of communism! What does it more than the representative citizens of Chicago. . . . Who bribes the Common Council? It is not men in the common walks of life. It is your representative citizens, your capitalists, your business men. When have they come to the front, either individually or collectively, and inveighed against this manner of obtaining franchises? When will they come to the front, individually or collectively, and ask of the Common Council to demand adequate remuneration for the city? Never, to my knowledge. . . . If an assessor grows rich while in office, with whom does he divide? Not with the common people. He divides with the man who tempts him to make a low assessment, not the man who has the humble little house, but the capitalist and the business man. These are plain words, but they are true."

Although there are wealthy men in Chicago who are truly interested in securing all that the Mayor urged, yet the fact that he could bring such an indictment, with little subsequent rebuke from even those he was addressing, is very significant of the alarming situation that confronts us.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We must bear in mind, however, that the conditions in older cities are probably somewhat better. At all events we are bound to go through a period of attempted—and, it may be, fairly successful—regulation, as in Toronto and Detroit, before very much city ownership is tried. With this in mind, reformers might well concentrate their efforts upon securing the following principles, among others, in the charters of all large cities:—

1. No special permit or privilege, popularly known as a franchise, for the use of the streets or alleys, should be granted for longer than ten years, save for thirty years in the cases of elevated or underground roads, and for twenty years in the cases of surface street-car lines and of gas-works.

2. No franchise should be capable of renewal or extension until within a year of its expiration, nor should any permit for change of motive power, or for the extension of any system by new construction, or lease from another company, operate as such an extension. This would prevent the sudden grasp of new power from a complaisant city council elected on other issues.

3. Although it would seem self-evident that, after the expiration of a franchise, a city would have the right to purchase the plant of the company that possessed the franchise at the cost of construction, less all depreciation, as fixed by arbitrators, yet the decisions of our courts are so much more sensitive to private than to public interests and rights, that able lawyers advise a specific provision in the franchise for city purchase on the above conditions. This might well include the purchase of power-houses and engines, in the case of a street-car company, or the manufacturing plant of a gas or electric-light company, even if such were not in the streets or parks, provided they were needed by the city for itself or for a new company succeeding to the lease. Doubtless it would be well, where possible, to provide for the reversion to the city, without pay, at the end of the franchise, of all property in the streets. Where this is impracticable, or perhaps in any case, a city might well construct and own from the start all street mains, conduits, and tracks, on which an operating company should pay the equivalent of interest and depreciation; or the city might have a recognized ownership and control, even though the actual construction should be done by the operating company.

4. All franchises on different portions of a system should by law expire at the same time, which should be the earliest period of expiration of any franchise on any part of the system. At present many of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these city monopolies very cleverly arrange different times for the expiration of franchises on various portions of the line, so that a city can never take an independent stand and offer the whole system to the best bidder.

5. The city should expressly reserve the right to require an increased number of street cars and other public conveniences, when, in its judgment, public accommodation requires them, and it is physically possible to provide them.

6. The accounts of all companies holding municipal franchises should be open to full investigation by the proper city authorities, and sworn statements by such companies should be provided for, not only to determine taxes, but to enable the people to ascertain the profits and thus determine the wisdom of a re-lease or of city ownership.

7. Near the end of a lease or franchise period, on petition of a certain proportion of the citizens, a popular vote should be had on the question of city operation, and five years later another vote on the question of going back to private ownership should be taken, in case city ownership were tried.

8. No franchise should be awarded by a city council until approved by a board of public works, or by the chief of that department of city administration and by the comptroller. Perhaps, also, the mayor might be given an absolute veto.

9. Finally, in accordance with the above principles, franchises should be let at auction to the company offering the city the highest proportion of gross receipts.

Substantially all the above suggestions, excepting the seventh, were indorsed and couched in legal phraseology in the winter of 1894–5 by a committee of some of the ablest lawyers of Chicago, but they made little impression upon the monopoly-dominated Illinois legislature of that year.

Most of what has been said above with special reference to street-car franchises will apply equally to the gas question. Here, too, the difficulties of regulation are great. The most thorough trial of public regulation in the world has probably been made by the Massachusetts Gas- and Electric-Light Commission. Its power to reduce rates, order improvements, forbid stock-watering, and secure full returns of cost of construction and operation, even in the case of previously existing charters, furnishes a precedent, as do our State railroad commissions, for the similar action that is likely to be taken before long with our street railways. In fact, a beginning has been made in this direction in New

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

York, and perhaps in one or two other States. But while some good results have been attained in Massachusetts, there is much doubt of the strength and courage of the commission. Despite its efforts, and undue legal restrictions upon city ownership, the demand for city ownership in the case of lighting-plants is steadily growing in that State.

Personal investigations for several years have convinced me that, upon the whole, success has attended city ownership of gas-works in this country. The worst and most advertised experiment has been in Philadelphia; but in that city there appears to be far more corruption in the relations of the city council to the privately-owned street-car lines than in all departments of the public gas-works. Very significant is the editorial of December 16, 1895, in a leading gas journal that has always opposed city ownership,—"The Progressive Age":—

> "The most strenuous efforts of the unscrupulous machine element in the politics of that city [Philadelphia] have been directed, not toward the retention of the gas-works under municipal ownership and control, as being the policy of greatest pecuniary advantage and therefore sole interest to the office-holders, but toward the sale of the gas-works again into private ownership."

To this end the far-seeing council has constantly refused to appropriate needed money for improvements. Thus, with apparent design, the council plays into the hands of a private company that supplies part of the gas already to the city gas holders at a higher price than would be the cost in an improved city plant. Yet during nine out of ten years since 1840, Philadelphia has had cheaper gas and higher financial returns under public ownership than has Brooklyn or New York under private control. Space forbids reference to the greater success of city gas-works in other places, or to the interesting way in which Cleveland, Ohio, a few years ago, secured a reduction in price to eighty cents per thousand feet, five cents of that going to the city as a tax.

A great mistake is made by the average merchant and manufacturer, when he stands aloof from these questions, and fears that there is something dangerously socialistic in the effort to introduce the changes above outlined. On the contrary, the great majority of the citizens of Richmond, Va., who believe in the success of their city-owned gas-works, thus held by the city since 1852, are far from being convinced, as are the socialists, that all competition is bad and must in time yield to societary management. The same is true of Detroit, whose citizens a year ago voted four to one for city ownership of street-car lines; or of Toronto, whose favorable lease has been described.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Speaking of the present difficulties in the way of reforms in taxation and in the bestowal of franchises,—reforms that go to the bottom of things far differently from reforms in street, educational, and police departments,—one of the leading lawyers of the United States lately remarked to me:—

"I would enjoy nothing better than to lead a Lexow investigation as Goff did in New York; but no man can afford to do it as it ought to be done, in my city, unless he is worth half a million dollars. For example, I am forced to seek accommodations at the banks; but they handle the stocks and bonds of the powerful companies holding franchises or controlling assessors and other city departments to such a degree that, if I began a really vigorous contest for the people's rights, I could probably not secure banking favors at a single bank. With an expensive family, and the fact staring me in the face that it is to these powerful corporations that lawyers must resort for large fees, I confess I am not heroic enough to take up the cudgels for reform."

But the only way to secure general respect for wealth and for law and order is to purge our business dealings with the public of hypocrisy and corruption, and to insist that the Decalogue be observed equally by all. Surely it is the merest common sense that the people should use their streets and powers of taxation in the interest of justice and fair dealing and in a way to secure the interests of all instead of the profit of a few.

It seems hardly necessary to add that nothing is farther from my intention than to attack wealth as wealth, or to convey the false idea that the ordinary manufacturing, mercantile, or banking corporation is deserving of attack or is interested, in the long run, in misgovernment. Rather have all these legitimate business enterprises a great deal to gain by such reforms as have been indicated, since, by removing the popular sense of injustice, they would render the possession of honestly acquired property more secure. The millionaire is not *per se* any different from other people. When individuals of this class, however, do corrupt the body politic, the responsibility and injury are worse than when done by those in lower station; just as the opposite is true,—that honest business methods among the wealthy are not only common, but are a powerful inspiration to the rest of society. Neither must it be assumed that all city monopolies deal corruptly with public bodies, for there are most honorable exceptions. An old friend and prominent engineer of a large electric-light combination in the East assures me that he has found it entirely possible to secure franchises honestly, and has often done it. We must even admit that the average citizen would do much the same as the average manager of a great monopoly, were he in a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

similar position. This is not a class struggle. Simply, there is need of a new civic education and a new social conscience in all ranks of society.

It is not so much any radical industrial reorganization that is immediately needed, as a revolution in all our ethical conceptions of public righteousness, and of our duty to advance the same at whatever personal sacrifice. Our very strongest and most reputable citizens must consent to accept nomination—when freely tendered by their neighbors—for aldermanic and other municipal offices. For our ablest and most honored citizens selfishly to scorn public station and expect the intricate affairs of our enormous cities to be intelligently managed by cheap and mediocre talent, however honest, is absurd. It is more: it is a crime. The public conscience must also be so aroused as to take possession of ward club and primary as well as polling-booth, to the end that true friends of the people may take the place of the modern aldermen and other city officials, who hold that since posterity has done nothing for them, they need do nothing for posterity. Nor must work stop with the election. Every day thereafter a watchful though friendly public opinion must support the courageous and efficient public officer in his efforts to realize in some measure, in every place, the vision of the White City that we saw in 1893.

EDWARD W. BEMIS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MANITOBA SCHOOLS QUESTION.

BRITISH journals have spoken of the Manitoba Schools question as one that threatened to break up Canadian Confederation. This it never was. But it has brought into active play the antagonistic elements of which the Confederation is composed, and it has bred trouble, almost agony, among the politicians. The Catholic vote in Canada is nearly two-fifths of the whole vote, and, though not actually solid, it does to a considerable extent hold together under its ecclesiastical chiefs, while the Protestant vote, except in extreme cases of anti-papal excitement, is disunited, and attempts to carry the country by riding the Protestant horse have generally failed. The appearance of a religious issue is extremely perplexing to the leaders of both political parties, who want both Catholic and Protestant, but particularly Catholic, support.

The historical and legal intricacies of the question can have little interest for the American reader. Manitoba, in the early days of her existence as a Province, while the Catholics were still relatively a considerable vote, adopted the system of Separate schools, which is still in force not only in Catholic Quebec but in Protestant Ontario, while the Catholics tried in vain to introduce it in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. The Catholics having now, by the influx of Protestant settlers, become an inconsiderable minority, the Provincial Legislature of Manitoba passed an Act abolishing Separate Catholic schools. The Catholics protested against the Act as unconstitutional and *ultra vires*, alleging that the Separate system was a privilege inviolably secured to them by the Act of the Dominion Parliament admitting Manitoba as a Province to the Confederation. The courts in the upshot upheld the Act of the Manitoban Legislature. But ultimately the British Privy Council, to which the case was carried, decided to give the Catholics of Manitoba the benefit of a special provision in the Manitoba Act empowering parties aggrieved in regard to this matter to carry their grievance before the Governor-General in Council. In the last resort the Dominion Parliament may proceed to redress the grievance by remedial legislation. The Catholics of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Manitoba having carried their grievance before the Governor-General and the Privy Council,—that is in effect before the Ministry of the day,—the Ministry of the day, which is Conservative and generally enjoys the support of the Catholic vote, has launched against Manitoba a project of remedial legislation. Manitoba, knowing that the Protestant Provinces will not march upon her, faces the thunderbolt without flinching, and has just, at an election held upon the issue, given an overwhelming majority to the anti-Separatist Government. The project of remedial legislation must now go before the Parliament at Ottawa, and great are the searchings of heart among the politicians, especially among those whose seats depend on a mixed Catholic and Protestant vote. Protestant feeling in Ontario has been stirred to an unusual degree; to such a degree as severely to shake the Ministerial ranks in the Province and to cause the leader of the Orangemen to secede from the Government. Mr. D'Alton McCarthy, a Toronto lawyer of eminence, leads off from the Conservative party, mainly on this issue, a party of his own which is showing strength in the bye-elections. It is supposed that division on this question within the Government has had something to do with the extraordinary scene of intrigue and mutiny which has ended in the virtual dethronement of Sir Mackenzie Bowell from the leadership and the installation of Sir Charles Tupper in his place, though for this there were other and more tangible motives, as will presently appear. Nor are the Opposition leaders at their ease, though they are in the happier position of critics. Mr. Laurier, the Liberal chief, being himself a French Catholic from Quebec, and looking for the support of his compatriots, is in a particularly delicate situation. On the stump he has had to go through an acrobatic performance of a most difficult kind, leaning before Catholic constituencies a little to one side, before Protestant constituencies a little to the other, and using Provincial autonomy as the pole by which he balanced himself on the perilous rope. A gulf has yawned for him on either side. Even his comparison of the impregnable position, which he regarded himself as occupying, to the lines of Torres Vedras, proved not free from danger, since he was taken to task by some of his French constituents for what they conceived to be a complimentary allusion to a British victory.

The writer of an able and notable pamphlet[1] on this question opens

[1] "Is Manitoba Right? A Question of Ethics, Politics, Facts, and Law." A review of the Manitoba School Question. Published by the "Winnipeg Tribune."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by reminding us of the wisdom of Jefferson, who bade us frequently recur to first principles. The foundation of the public school system and of the tax by which it is supported are laid bare to inspection by this controversy. Is education the duty of the parent and those to whom the parent commits it, or is it the duty of the state? Has the state a right to supersede the parent or the church to which the parent entrusts his authority and to insist that the child shall be educated in its own way? It is evident that if the public-school system and the school tax are accepted and established no privilege can be allowed. The Roman Catholic Church cannot claim to be alone of all the religions recognized and respected by the state, while the rest—Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Unitarian, or whatever they may be—are swept with Secularism and Agnosticism into a common heap as unworthy of consideration. By consenting to this, the state, though it would not endow, would morally establish, the Roman Catholic Church. In a land of equality such a distinction is monstrous, though the power of the Roman Catholic hierarchy sustains it in Ontario and, with open voting for the election of school trustees—a form specially favorable to the influence of the priest. But supposing the Catholics were to abandon the ground of privilege, and, planting themselves on the broad principle of parental right, to declare against state compulsion and taxation altogether, logically to dislodge them might not be quite so easy. Their opponents would at all events be put to a defence of the fundamental principles of the system. That a man is by nature bound to provide education as well as food and clothing for the children whom by his own act he brings into the world; that he has a right to educate his children in any way which his conscience directs; and that you have no right by state taxation to take from him the means of so doing, and to force him to educate his children in the way which you prefer but to which he objects, are three propositions which, supposing natural right to prevail, call apparently for definite answers. The answer to them presumably is that the policy of a republic in which all exercise political power requires that all should undergo education. To this it might be rejoined, first, that the purpose of the state would be answered by an educational qualification for the franchise; and second, that it seems doubtful whether the children of the class for which the safeguard is chiefly needed are generally in school. Reports seem rather to indicate that a number of these children are truants, or shrink, as the ragged are apt to do, from taking their seats in school beside the better dressed. Voluntary charity, however im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perfect and irregular, picks out, regardless of rags, the class that is most in need. Malthusians would perhaps add that a system of public alms, whether in the shape of free breakfasts or free education, tends to the improvident increase of population, which, in crowded countries, is beginning to be recognized as a serious danger.

The Catholic says that he wants a religious education for his child because only religion can form character. You send him to Mr. John Stuart Mill who will show him that it is not religious doctrine that forms character, but moral precept enveloped in religious doctrine and enforced by the authority of the parent and the teacher. He will retort that, unless you are an agnostic, you acknowledge the efficiency of religion in education yourself, and he can even point, it seems, to the introduction of a slight religious element into the school course of Manitoba as a proof of the truth of what he says. If you offer him an hour set apart for religious teaching through his priests, he will tell you that what he wants for the formation of a religious character is not a single hour allotted to doctrinal instruction, but the whole school life and surroundings of the child. You tell him—the author of the pamphlet already mentioned tells him—that his religion is objectionable because it diverts the citizen's allegiance to a foreign power, and because it is shown by history to be adverse to the progress of industry, knowledge, and general civilization. He will reply that if his religion is incompatible with his allegiance you ought not to lay your hands upon his children but to exclude him from the political franchise, and that, as to the second count of the indictment, he has an immense proportion of Christendom with him in thinking that character, which depends on religion, rather than intelligence, is the source of usefulness and happiness, and in preferring the simple and pious pair of the "Angelus" to the go-ahead offspring of the non-religious public school. Your rejoinder, on the principles of a free country, ought, it would seem, to be not only conclusive but so manifestly conclusive as to warrant you in the exceptional use of coercion. For coercion is used when a man is forced by a school tax to maintain your system of education instead of his own.

The record of the Roman Catholic Church, in the countries where she was exclusively dominant, is very bad. Little better is the record of the Anglican Church during the period of her exclusive domination. But where religious freedom permits, and there is a mixture of sects, rivalry has its stimulating effect, and the Roman Catholic layman demands for his child such an education as may give him a fair chance against the Protestant in the race of life.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

England has just called a halt in the extermination of the voluntary schools which the late Minister of Education was carrying out with the apostolic zeal of a *défroqué*. The village school of England, with the parish clergymen and the good ladies of the parish to look after it, is, like other features of the manorial system, incapable of reproduction here. On the other hand, we have slid away probably from the original Scotch or New England type—which was highly religious and, being used by a small group of families, probably not unparental,—into a system which has a tendency to become a machine and to detach itself from the family, from the Church, and even from the general interest and intelligence of the community.

Public gratitude is due to Dr. Rice for impartial investigation of the system, the results of which originally appeared in THE FORUM.[1] Dr. Rice reports, with sorrow, that in the large proportion of instances the people take absolutely no active interest in their schools. He finds not one parent in a hundred, even in the best of homes, interested enough to protest against flagrant evils or to insist that the air of the class-rooms shall be fit to breathe and that the teacher's treatment of the pupils shall be humane. Dr. Rice also reports that the quality of the teaching varies greatly and in some schools is very low, as low apparently as it could be in any Separate school. Those in whose hands the system is are naturally, perhaps laudably, disposed to press and extend it with little regard to social economy or the needs of the country at large. In some of its developments it seems now to be causing a serious displacement of industry by educating youths out of agricultural callings into intellectual callings, which are becoming dangerously overstocked.

The public school system, whatever may be its comparative merits or defects, is firmly established on this continent. All the better can it afford to have its foundations examined. Its liegemen, like the advocates of socialistic legislation generally, identify themselves with the state, and are apt to conceive of the state as a power of unbounded wisdom and benevolence. But the state, if it is anything but an abstraction in which no qualities, rights, or duties can reside, is only the Government; and to the wisdom and benevolence of Government, whether national or municipal, while it is in anything like the present hands, few will deny that there must be bounds. Dr. Rice has repeatedly had occasion to complain of political influence. In one case he

[1] Subsequently published in book-form by the Century Company, New York, under the title "The Public School System of the United States."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

says that it has ruined the schools. From political influence and jobbery at all events the voluntary system is free.

This Manitoba School affair has also interest as an episode in the struggle between the British and French races, which are severally identified with the Protestant and Catholic religions. Canada, when England took her over from France, had not more than sixty thousand inhabitants, almost all of the poorest class, who might probably have been Anglicized with ease. That they were treated on the opposite principle, that their language was respected and their religion recognized, was due, it may be surmised, to the necessity of preserving their allegiance in the face of the American Revolution, which may thus, in a certain sense, be said to have extended to Canada. This policy, combined with the hostility of the Canadian priests to New England Puritanism and afterward to the atheism of the French Revolution, kept the people loyal to Great Britain. The conqueror, however, had given them votes which they used to throw off his ascendancy, and there was a constant fight between them and the English minority in possession of office down to 1837, when they broke out into rebellion, simultaneously, though hardly in concert, with the rebellion against arbitrary government and the Family Compact in the British Province. Lord Durham thought he had achieved a master-stroke of statesmanship when he united the two Provinces. The French element, being the weaker, he imagined, would be politically dominated by the stronger element and ultimately absorbed. Never was there a greater mistake. The weaker race, being perfectly combined in defence of its threatened interests, formed a solid vote which dominated the United Parliament; while, instead of being absorbed, it has absorbed and is continuing to absorb outlying portions of the British element which come within or touch its pale. An American politician once showed the writer that he at least had not fixed the eye of territorial greed on Canada by asking whether the French in Canada were naturalized. They are not only very much naturalized, but regard themselves as the only genuine natives, and when they speak of a Canadian mean a Frenchman.

Prior to Canadian Confederation and the transfer of the North-West from the Hudson's Bay Company to the Dominion, that vast expanse had been the abode of five thousand French and as many English Half-breeds, who, with two thousand whites, largely Canadian, and the Indian tribes, made up the population. Organized authority and civilization were represented by the staff of the Hudson's Bay Company, whose lives in their lonely and Arctic stations form a curi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ous chapter of commercial history. The Half-breeds were hunters, trappers, boatmen, and wandering traders. The Roman Catholic Church was represented by a few priests and marked the region ecclesiastically for her own. When the sale and transfer took place, adventurers began to stake out the land in a way alarming to the Half-breeds and subversive of their squatter rights. The Half-breeds suspected, not without reason, that civilization was going to improve them out of existence. They organized for their defence and formed a provisional government under Louis Riel, a leader who had something in him of the commander, but more, apparently, of the medicine man, and was not the less fitted on that account to sway ignorant and half civilized people. Riel twice headed Half-breed insurrections, and met a tragic doom in the second. The disturbance called the Red River Rebellion and the execution of the Loyalist Scott, which fiercely excited Protestant Canada, were the results. The Half-breeds cared, it may safely be said, for nothing but their right to the land. But the priest whom they sent to Ottawa with a presentation of their claims, slipped—it is alleged—by pious fraud into their Bill of Rights a clause giving the Catholics Separate schools.

The Manitoba Legislature was at first organized, as the Legislature of the Dominion still is, on the bi-racial and bi-lingual principles, while the French and Catholic element, led politically as well as ecclesiastically by its Archbishop, struggled to hold its ground against British and Protestant immigration. Colonization in the French and Catholic interest was attempted but failed. The British and Protestant element has gained the complete ascendancy, in token of which the official use of the French language in the Provincial Legislature has been abolished. The last pulse of French resistance was the second rebellion of Riel, which had its source, like the first, in the fears of the Half-breeds for their lands. The hearts of the French in Quebec were on the side of the Half-breeds; and though at the call of the Government two battalions of Quebec militia marched against the rebels, political colonels found reasons for withdrawing from command. French excitement, however, proved evanescent. Perhaps Manitoba was rather beyond the mental range of the "habitant" of Quebec. The leader of the Opposition in the Dominion Parliament, moving, on the faith of French support, against the execution of Riel, found the support fail him and met with a damaging defeat. In the east of Canada, however, the French element has been gaining ground and extruding the British not only from the district in the Province of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Quebec called the eastern townships, which was once entirely British, but from the Eastern counties of Ontario. French nationality instead of breaking up or being absorbed is growing more solid and pronounced than ever, while the connection with the mother country, long suspended by the French Revolution, is being renewed. Intense excitement was produced in Quebec by the Franco-German war. The digestive powers of British Canada are far too limited to enable it to assimilate a mass so large, so compact, and so thoroughly distinct.

Attention has also been directed by the controversy to some points of Canadian Confederation. The author of "Is Manitoba Right?" exclaims against the absurdity of allowing such an enactment as that of Separate schools to be made binding on a community for ever, especially by an embryo Legislature of Half-breeds. There would be no answer to him if Manitoba or the Dominion were independent. But they are dependencies of Great Britain, at whose hands they have received a constitution which they have no power to change, and to which the Catholics now appeal. One anomaly is just as great and as shocking to natural reason as the other.

The authors of Confederation would have preferred a legislative union. From this they were debarred by the division of races and the jealousy of the French Province. But they so far succeeded in their centralizing policy as to give the central Legislature the residuary power, which, by the American Constitution, is given to the several States. Thus it comes to pass that the Dominion Legislature has to deal with a question of education, bringing a question of religion in its train. Americans may be thankful that in their case nothing of the kind is possible. If, in addition to all the present torches of discord, religious quarrels were to be imported into Congress, the Republic would be torn to pieces.

The provision for an appeal to the Governor-General in Council exemplifies the British love of constitutional figments and the price paid for its indulgence. The Governor-General has been divested by the constitutionalizing process of almost the last remnant of real power. He is a pale counterpart of the crown upon a cushion by which the British republic is surmounted. Yet legislation still proceeds upon the assumption that an appeal to him is an appeal to a superior and impartial power. In point of fact, it is an appeal to a party Ministry acting in his name. Party strategy dictates the answer, and the party struggle decides whether the answer shall take legislative effect.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Speaking the other day of the Copyright question, respecting which the Canadian Legislature and the Colonial Office are at issue, the Canadian Minister of Justice claimed for Canada, in peremptory tones, liberty to "govern herself or to misgovern herself" as she pleased, without regard to any Imperial veto or deference to British interests. In effect this liberty has been conceded so far as legislation is concerned, the Colonial Office having in this very case shrunk from putting the Imperial veto on a Canadian Act when it was clearly required for the protection not only of the rights of British authors but of Imperial relations with foreign countries. The judiciary of the Empire alone still retains its authority unimpaired. Appeals from all the Colonies and Dependencies are still carried, as in this Manitoba case, to a tribunal at Westminster, which sits in judgment one day upon a question of Canadian education, next day upon a commercial case from Australia, and then upon a suit concerning a Hindoo inheritance with the right to perform the family sacrifice annexed. Nor is the decision ever questioned, though complaints of a want of acquaintance with the local circumstances of the Dependency are sometimes heard.

At this writing all is uncertainty at Ottawa, owing to the confusion resulting from the success of the conspiracy for the dethronement of Sir Mackenzie Bowell and the installation of Sir Charles Tupper in his room. But the supposed intention of Sir Charles Tupper and the son to whom he probably hopes to bequeath his power, is to assume the headship of the Roman Catholic interest, and, with that object in view, to carry into effect in Manitoba the measure of remedial legislation announced at the opening of the present session in the speech from the throne. Such a policy might be successful for a time, especially if to the Catholic vote a Tupper Government is enabled, by one of the bargains which are in the air, to add the support of the Canadian Pacific Railway, aptly nicknamed the "Government on Wheels." But in the end the Conservative party, if it binds itself to the car of Roman Catholic hierarchy, can hardly fail to rouse a Protestant resistance, which, if roused, will certainly prevail. How Manitoba is to be coerced into acceptance of remedial legislation is a problem still to be solved, for the Protestants of Ontario will certainly not take arms to enforce on their co-religionists in Manitoba, for the benefit of Roman Catholics, a system of Separate schools.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COST OF AN ANGLO-AMERICAN WAR.

We have lately been told by the jingoists,—who, under the cant of patriotism, promote aggressive violence in our relations with other countries,—that the honor of this nation must not be weighed against mere dollars and cents. That may be admitted; but when it is proposed to dishonor the country by an aggressive and violent jingo policy without warrant of any kind, it becomes fit to count the cost of possible war in dollars and cents in order to bring the malignant influence of the jingo faction into most conspicuous notice. The mere suggestion of such a crime,—destructive to the welfare of this and of the mother country alike,—as a war between the two great branches of the English-speaking people, has been met by such an instantaneous protest from clergymen and laymen alike, from employers and laborers, from chambers of commerce and labor unions, as to have almost wholly removed the danger. That decree for the maintenance of peace, good-will, and mutual service has been uttered with such effect, both in this country and in Great Britain, as to render the jingo faction in Congress powerless and to forbid the Executive officers of either government from disregarding it.

In the last and during the early part of the present century the purpose of European governments in securing and governing their colonies was to retain the sole regulation of their trade and manufactures, under the mistaken idea that such a policy would benefit the parent state. Among European countries Great Britain alone has reversed her former colonial policy during the greater part of the nineteenth century,—to our great benefit as well as to her own. The efforts of the Dutch are still in some measure to retain the sole control of the traffic of their possessions in the East. The aim of Germany, France, and even Italy in securing dominion over parts of Asia and Africa is to control colonial trade and to limit colonial purchases to home goods. England alone opens her own ports and those of all her colonies to the world's commerce,—subject to the terms, methods of collecting the revenue by duties upon imports, and financial policy which each colony may choose to adopt,—on condition that the same rules shall be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

applied to the trade with the mother country as to that of all other countries.

We may now notice the results of the later British colonial policy as compared with that of all other nations, and especially with that of the Spanish-American states still existing in most of the so-called republics which have displaced the former Spanish rule in South and Central America. In the consideration of the following statistics of the imports and exports of this country attention must be given to several conditions.

First, it will become apparent that the purchasing power of the foreign countries which have taken from us on the average during the last ten years at least 15 per cent of our whole farm product,—or between 6 and 7 per cent of our total product, giving employment in domestic industry to at least 1,500,000 of our own people in producing these exports,—is in proportion to their application of science, invention, and machinery to all the arts of life. The greater their progress in the application of mechanism to their own productions, the greater their purchasing power with respect to the food, fuel, fibres, metals. and manufactures with which we supply them.

Second, it will be apparent that in proportion to the application of mechanism to the conversion of food, fuel, metals, and fibres into finished or manufactured fabrics, the wages, and consequently the purchasing power, of the workmen in the countries to which the greatest part of our exports is distributed, have been augmented, while the cost of the fabrics used by them has been lessened. The greatest purchasing power and the greatest selling power, next to our own, lie with Great Britain, where the wages of the workmen are higher than anywhere else in Europe and where the cost of the greater part of the products is much less.

Third, it will appear that the purchasing power of the nations and states of Asia, Africa, and South America is very limited, because modern methods of production are least applied by their inhabitants; consequently products are mainly those of hand-work, yielding very low wages. Hence our commerce, or the exchange of our own products for the crude products of these non-machine-using nations or states, is very much less—ratably to the number of persons who might be supplied by us if their purchasing power were greater—than it is with the machine-using nations of Europe.

It is often said that "trade follows the flag." It is the flag symbolizing energy, personal liberty, intelligence, and a just government

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that carries trade to the uttermost parts of the earth. Our flag would now rival that of England had we not continued the very errors which so long hampered her,—in our navigation acts, which were modelled on her act repealed in 1853, or thereabouts, and in the other measures by which we have obstructed the progress of our own commerce.

Lastly, it will appear from the consideration of the following table that the great groups of the English-speaking people of all sections of the world are becoming more and more interdependent, and are year by year enjoying an increasing benefit from the exchange of their products, as the obstructions of distance and time are overcome. On the other hand, the more complete our own applications of science, invention, and machinery to mining, metallurgy, agriculture, and manufactures, the greater our ability to supply other countries with the products of mines, fields, forests, and factories. In all these pursuits, without exception, the wages or earnings of the workmen which are recovered from the sales, either for domestic or foreign consumption, are higher than those of any other country, while the cost of labor in the product is lower in almost all productions which are of necessary rather than of voluntary use,—else none could be exported. A glance over the outward manifests of ocean steamers which are given in the commercial papers day by day will prove these assertions.

The home valuation of the exports of this country has averaged a fraction under $800,000,000 per year for ten years, amounting in the aggregate to $7,943,346,955. These exports consist of the products of our farms to the extent of more than 80 per cent. Their production has given employment in domestic industry to more than a million and a half men out of an aggregate of twenty million persons occupied in gainful pursuits. Without this export—that is to say, had it not been possible to sell this excess of our products to other countries, or rather to exchange it for the goods and wares which we import—these men (about 1,500,000), mainly consisting of farmers, would have been without occupation and in a state of compulsory idleness for long and intermittent terms. We export what we cannot consume, while our imports consist mainly of the products of tropical or semi-tropical countries and of the crude or partly manufactured articles which are necessary in the processes of our own domestic industry. The table on the opposite page sets forth the proportionate value to ourselves of the markets of all the states of the world.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VALUATION AND DESTINATION OF THE EXPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES.[1]

	EXPORTS. 1885 to 1894 Inc.	ANNUAL AVERAGE.	Per Cent of Total.	APPROXIMATE POPULATION.	
Great Britain and Ireland	4,060,135,619	406,013,562	51.12	40,000,000	
British Colonies and Dependencies	712,054,131	71,205,413	8.97	10,000,000 300,000,000	White. Mixed.
	4,772,189,750	477,218,975	60.09	350,000,000	
France, Germany, Holland, and Belgium	1,809,533,962	180,953,396	22.78	174,000,000	
	6,581,723,712	658,172,371	82.87		
Russia, Austria, and other European States	482,379,273	48,237,927	6.07	230,000,000	
	7,064,102,985	706,410,298	88.94		
China, Japan, and other Countries in Asia not under British Rule	116,481,826	11,648,182	1.47		
Africa, not under British Control	6,847,818	684,782	.09		
Hawaiian, Philippine, and other Islands not British or Spanish	44,348,757	4,434,876	.56	572,000,000	
Small Unenumerated Places	13,953,245	1,395,324	.17		
	7,245,734,631	724,573,462	91.23		
South America, omitting British Guiana	295,285,939	29,528,594	3.70	36,000,000	
Spanish and French West Indies, Haiti and San Domingo	244,755,771	24,475,577	3.08	2,500,000	
Mexico	113,517,519	11,351,752	1.43	12,000,000	
Central America, omitting British Honduras	44,053,095	4,405,309	.56	3,500,000	
United States				70,000,000	
	$7,943,346,955	$794,334,694	100	1,450,000,000	

In this table we have conclusive proof that trade follows five lines somewhat in inverse proportion to population.

1. To countries in which the just and firm administration of English rule assures the greatest volume of traffic.

2. To countries in which the purchasing power is developed by the application of modern science and invention to production.

3. In ratio to the capacity of the people of each section of each continent to share in the benefits of stable government or to establish such government by their own consent.

[1] AUTHORITY—Report of 1895, Bureau of Statistics, U. S. Treasury.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

4. Trade exists and increases only in ratio to the maintenance of a stable form of government of some kind.

5. Trade is progressive upon the American continents and islands, only in so far as the inheritance of the Spanish rule—of forceful privation of the people to the gain of corrupt classes—is thrown off.

In evidence witness the statistics of trade in the same sequence:

1. The purchasing power of Great Britain and her colonies, next to ourselves the machine-using states of the world, is 60 per cent of our food, metals, fibres, and fabrics exported.

2. The purchasing power of France, Germany, and the low countries, which come next in order in the use of modern mechanism, is 23 per cent, these countries combined being our next largest customers.

3. Austria, Russia, Turkey, Italy and the lesser states of Europe,—suffering want in many ways, yet possessed of territory which, if under the beneficent rule and just laws by which English-speaking people are governed, might supply the whole of Europe with food in huge abundance,—can buy of us but 6 per cent of our exports.

4. The hordes of Asia and Africa not under English rule or protection take less than 2½ per cent.

5. The huge area of the continent of South America and the states of Central America and Mexico—over 9,000,000 square miles in extent, or a third more than the habitable area of Europe and the United States combined—held in possession by less than fifty-five million people, mostly of mixed blood—are kept back and retarded by the inherited wrongs and evil influences of Spanish rule. Although equal to any other area of the earth's surface in the productions of the tropics, the semi-tropics, and the temperate zones, the people occupying this great area can buy of us less than 9 per cent of our exports. How shall this great area be redeemed? As the present hazard of war among the English-speaking people has been incurred in dealing with this problem, a yet more minute analysis must be made.

The main point of interest in the previous statistical analysis of our export trade is this indication of lack of purchasing power among the Spanish-American states of the two continents of America.

Since Mexico established a constitutional government on a firmer basis, and since her territory was opened by railways, her purchasing power has greatly increased, yet with a far more prolific territory and a better climate than are possessed by our neighbors in Canada, her twelve millions of people could only buy of us annually for ten years less than $12,000,000 worth of our products at less than $1 per head,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against an average of $39,000,000 worth taken by the five millions of Canada at a fraction under $8 per head. The three and a half million people under Spanish-American rule in the Central American states lying between Mexico and the Isthmus of Panama could only buy of us less than $4,500,000 worth of goods at $1.29 per head, against more than $8,000,000 worth taken by one million three hundred and forty thousand of the English-speaking people of the British possessions of South and Central America, of Jamaica and other West India Islands at $5.96 per head. The thirty-six million persons of Spanish-American descent, and those who are governed by them, occupying the continent of South America, aside from the little portion known as British Guiana, could only buy of us less than $30,000,000 worth a year of our products at 83 cents per head, against an average of more than $10,000,000 worth bought by less than three and a half million English-speaking people of Australia and New Zealand—who are only one-tenth the number compared with the mixed races occupying the whole of South America—at $2.86 per head. The two hundred and eighty thousand people of British Guiana have bought of us $1,787,646 worth of goods per year on the average at $6.38 per head, against $3,615,252 worth bought by two and a half million Venezuelans at $1.45 per head. The thirty-two thousand inhabitants of British Honduras have made average annual purchases from us of $373,605 at $11.68 per head, while three and a half million other inhabitants of Central America have purchased from us $4,405,309 per year at $1.26 per head. Were our exports to South America equal proportionately to those to Australia and New Zealand, our exports to that continent would average $125,000,000 a year in place of $30,000,000.

The same general rule which governs our exports holds with respect to imports. Although Great Britain has passed gold to our credit in pounds sterling annually for the last ten years at the rate of $240,000,000 for her excess of purchases from us over her sales to us, yet at the annual average of $164,000,000 of goods imported from Great Britain by us we are her largest single customer. The balance of our merchandise traffic with Great Britain and Ireland in the years 1885 to 1894, which was placed to our credit in gold coin, amounted to more than $2,400,000,000. This great sum has been derived mainly from our sales to her people of cotton, corn, provisions, dairy products, and the like. The number of farmers, cotton growers, millers, and the like, whose occupation depends exclusively upon the British market for the consumption of their products, is not less than one million.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The war of the jingoists would be more destructive to agriculture in its first effect than upon any other branch of domestic industry.

It is noticeable that in our traffic with the manufacturing states of Europe—Great Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, and Holland—there has been placed to our credit each year for the last ten years in gold coin $250,000,000. In ten years $2,500,000,000 has been the balance due us on the excess of our exports of merchandise to these countries over the imports from them, and this credit has been mainly for farm products sold to them on a gold basis. The exports from these countries to other parts of the world, from the sale of which they obtain the means to pay us in gold, are very largely to countries which are on the silver standard or on depreciated paper. Hence the cost and burden of converting sales made on a bad-money basis to terms of good money in gold in order to satisfy us have fallen upon these states of Europe. Had our credit been maintained, as it would have been except for the incapacity of our own Congress,—an incapacity about equally divided between the two parties,—we should have possessed not only the control over the gold reserves of the world as well as over our own product, but this country would have become, on a gold basis, as England now is, the place of safe deposit for the capital of the world. In very reverse of this true policy our incapable Congresses have devoted themselves to the free coinage of silver, to the purchase of silver bullion, or to what is called the "bimetallic system." This latter term means the enactment of a treaty of alternate or optional legal tender of gold and silver at the choice of the debtor country, the creditor country being deprived of any choice in the matter. Under such a treaty these great manufacturing nations of Europe could force us to accept, at a fixed ratio to gold, the silver derived from the sale of their exports to silver-using countries, without any regard to its real or commercial value. Good money is that kind of coin which is worth as much after it is melted or hammered smooth as it purports to be worth in the coin. In international traffic good money is the only standard, bad money—money not worth so much after it is melted as it purports to be worth in the coin—being refused.

It follows that the mis-representatives of the grain-growing and cotton-producing States in the Senate have lately voted to enable Great Britain, our principal creditor for provisions, cotton, and grain, to pay our farmers for their products in bad money. This act has been done at the dictation of the attorneys of the silver miners, the products of whose mines possess an annual value of about one-third that of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hens' eggs produced in the barnyards of these same farmers and cotton growers. If financial ignorance can be illustrated by any greater depth of folly—and in some cases of dishonor and fraud—one must seek far to find it. To this incapacity the present financial discredit, business depression, and threats of national dishonor are to be ascribed. One of the most potent influences brought to bear by the advocates of free silver-coinage is an appeal to the superficial animosity against Great Britain. One can hardly refrain from loss of dignity in characterizing the combination of folly and fraud which is exhibited by these inconsistent promoters of free silver. Actuated by animosity against Great Britain they yet propose and sustain a policy which would enable her to pay for our farm products in bad money, retaining to her own use and benefit the gold of which we hold the command whenever we choose to exert it. Our supplies of food and cotton are necessary to Great Britain in order to enable her to maintain her manufacturing supremacy over other European states while she keeps unimpaired the unit of value in gold—under the name of pound sterling—which has made London the banking centre of the world and England the place of safe deposit for the reserves of all nations in time of war. It is to be doubted whether the Senators who propose this great boon to Great Britain are actuated by very Christian motives of doing good to their supposed enemies; yet a more certain method of maintaining England's financial supremacy could not be invented than the one which has lately been supported by the votes of a majority of the Senators of the United States.

In my own single experience in the service of the Government, when commissioned in 1887 to report upon bimetallism in Europe, I had constant evidence of the amazement of every public financial officer, and the head of every great bank in Europe to whom I was accredited, at the folly of our Congress in assuming the useless burden incurred by our bad financial management and our constant purchases of silver bullion. On every side, even at that date, came prophetic testimony of our discredit which it was then patent would sooner or later ensue in Europe from the continuance in our erroneous course. The common remark of men in the highest financial positions in Europe at that time were also to this effect,—that so long as the United States hampered themselves with a bad monetary system and relieved Europe from the burden of depreciated silver by storing it in their Treasury, so long had Europe little to fear from competition with them in manufacturing, in arts, and in international commerce.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I recur now to the unquestioned data of our exports which make us the great creditor nation of the world in our traffic and would, if we did not tamper with our own credit, give us the command of the capital of the world on a gold basis.

Does it not follow from these unquestioned facts that the mother country and her descendants in all parts of the world are year by year becoming more interdependent and more and more capable of supplying each other's wants to the mutual service and benefit of all? That is the motive of commerce,—by which it lives and moves and has its being. If it did not profit all states and nations which exchange product for product, commerce could not exist. The mediæval error that in all commerce what one nation gains another must lose, is one of the most potent causes of the animosity against England which now depraves the minds of many people in this country.

Do not these facts again prove that the moral, ethical, and economical principles which ought to regulate and control the relations of the English-speaking peoples with each other lead to the same conclusion? No principle of political economy can be sustained which is inconsistent with moral, ethical, and political welfare. The science of trade and commerce rests upon as solid a basis in ethics as it does upon any other ground of its existence. If such are the necessary conclusions, then the jingo spirit which leads to violence and antagonism is as bad in its effect upon our material welfare as it is injurious to our morals and debasing in our politics.

It follows that the self-interest as well as the moral and political welfare of the people of the United States are bound up in a close commercial union with the other English-speaking peoples. The prosperity of the grain grower of the West, of the dairyman of the Middle States, and of the cotton grower of the South demands alike that every effort shall be exerted to overcome the prejudice and animosity which find their expression in jingoism. We have exerted the greatest physical effort in laying our railways, deepening our harbors, and opening the ways of commerce for the exchange of the surplus of our farms, our forests, our mines, and our factories for the products of other countries. The greater part of our imports consists of the hand-made products of the non-machine-using countries of the world,—the tea, the coffee, the sugar, the spices, the dye-woods, the wool, and other articles which are necessary in the processes of our domestic industry or for the support of the masses of the workmen who are employed therein. Webster once said that "we cannot afford to spend our intel-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ligent and well-paid labor in doing what foreign paupers can do so well for us." That is the motive of our commerce. For one day's product exported which has yielded the highest wages earned under our favorable conditions, we may secure in return the produce of ten days' work of the semi-pauper laborers of many parts of the world. Yet both are benefited by the exchange, and in the exact measure in which the conditions of our customers in other countries are raised above that of pauper laborers is their purchasing power increased and their commerce made more valuable to ourselves as well as to them.

From this analysis of our commerce and from other data which are now at our disposal, it has lately become plain that the opening and partition of Africa, although augmenting the knowledge of the resources of that continent and likely to lead to great individual wealth, will not provide homes for the increasing population which is beginning to press upon the resources of many sections of continental Europe. This surplus population must emigrate. The over-crowded area of Great Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, and Holland is but 560,000 square miles. The population of these countries is approximately 214,000,000; their inhabitants belong to the only races capable of home rule and also possessing the energy necessary to succeed as colonists. The only great section of the world of which a considerable part is not now under the control of the English-speaking people is South America, which alone has an area of 7,000,000 square miles, and a population approximately of 36,000,000. A very large section of that continent possesses a rich soil and a temperate climate, and is suitable in every way for the domicile of the Anglo-Saxon races. In what manner can the influences which have enabled the English-speaking people to establish peace, order, and industry wherever they have secured dominion be extended over that great continent? The day of aggression and conquest has passed. This work of bringing South America under the safe conditions of Anglo-American laws and customs can be accomplished only by consent of the people of the several states of the continent itself. The danger to them of foreign aggression, which was very great when Great Britain and the United States joined in support of what is known as the Monroe Doctrine for their protection, has also passed. It was equally to the interest and benefit of Great Britain and the United States to save them from foreign domination then, as later it was also to the equal advantage of Great Britain and the United States when the latter, after the civil war, warned the French to withdraw from Mexico.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Under the shock—caused by a perversion of the Monroe Doctrine—which even the possibility of a civil war between the English-speaking peoples has produced, it has become apparent that even such remote causes of animosity must be removed. In its present ill-defined form the Monroe Doctrine is used as a menace,—not as a safeguard according to its original purpose. But the common sense and the moral sense alike of England and the United States have been aroused: war has been forbidden, while even the threat of violence has been sternly rebuked. What now remains is to wrest safety from this danger and to bring the true harmony of interest and the true purpose of the English-speaking people to bear, so as to assure the application of the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine throughout both the continents of America. The way to accomplish this is plain, open, broad, and straight. It is for the interest of the masses of every state in South America that election by true ballot shall take the place of changes of a revolutionary kind by bullets, and that the safe conditions of Anglo-American law shall be established. When Great Britain and the United States are joined in the suppression of foreign aggression they may, without the exercise of force, induce all South American states to settle their disputes by adjudication or by arbitration.

The first cause of dispute consists in a question of title to land upon which citizens both of one South American state and of Great Britain hold claims of possession by right of occupancy. Titles to land when in dispute between private persons are subject to adjudication in a court of law. Disputed titles, between states, to land already occupied by one claimant may not rightly be arbitrated; but they are surely subjects of adjudication on questions of fact which would not be difficult to establish in an International Court of Law. Adjudication may be agreed to even by the strongest nation in cases where arbitration may not receive support.

The second class of questions which bring contention between states is alleged encroachments upon personal or maritime rights. These are surely subjects of arbitration in an International Court of Equity.

The next great subject for the joint action of the English-speaking peoples—in which all have the greatest interest—is the protection of commerce upon the seas. This may be assured by a commercial union among the English-speaking people for the protection of commerce; but suitable measures would unquestionably receive the support of so many other nations as to make it a department of international law. Not only must private property, other than contraband of war, be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exempt from seizure upon the sea, but privateering and the issue of letters of marque must be forbidden. It would be a righteous use of the navies of the English-speaking people combined to give protection to the commerce of all nations by enforcing this rule. It only needed the assent of the United States, so unwisely denied many years ago, to have made this also a part of international law. The destruction or plunder of commercial vessels by ships of war, even of combatants, must also cease, to the end that no basely named "commerce destroyers" may hereafter be suffered to exist. Acts which would disgrace an army upon the land must no longer be imposed as duties upon the navies of a nation claiming to be civilized.

While the armed defence of harbors may for a time continue to be necessary, lest for lack of precaution great injury might some time be done by the naval forces of some petty state of a semi-barbarous type, yet towns and cities which are not themselves fortified, or that form no part of the harbor defences, must hereafter be exempt from bombardment or from any other damage from naval forces, as they are now exempt from similar injury from land forces. This may also be made a part of international law.

Interoceanic canals and waterways must be neutralized and placed under the joint protection of the English-speaking peoples and of other states and nations which may join with them, so that immunity from damage to such waterways or from interruption in their service may be enforced with such power that no single state would dare resist.

Islands in mid-ocean, like the Sandwich Islands, Samoa, and perhaps ports of refuge on the distant coasts of continents, must be neutralized and thereafter placed under the joint protection of the great maritime powers, to the end that coaling-stations, cable-landings, and commercial agencies may be established upon equal terms by the people of any state,—no armament to be permitted upon the land and no hostile shot to be fired upon the sea at an agreed distance from these sanctuaries of peaceful commerce on the penalty of bringing into action the whole combined forces of the commercial states of the world to forbid a repetition of the wrong.

What stands in the way of this union for the protection of commerce and for the assurance of peace and plenty wherever the dominion of the English-speaking people and its influence extend?

With every step in popular government, under constitutional forms, for the protection of the interests of the great mass of working people, greater assurance of peace, order, and welfare has been given to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world. It is the misfortune of Great Britain to be so close to nations in which the dynastic war spirit still prevails as to be forced to expend great sums of money in order to sustain English law, English rule, and English influence wherever it has been established. We may take what exception we may to some of the arbitrary and dictatorial methods by which British rule—as well as our own—has sometimes been extended; but whether we will or no, our own interests are indissolubly connected with those of the mother country, and whether we recognize it as a duty or not, our own prosperity in great measure depends upon sustaining the principles of English liberty and protecting the commerce of the English-speaking people wherever these influences have been extended throughout the world.

Perhaps nothing but the shock of civil war between the two great English-speaking nations could have brought this matter to the issue in the way in which it is now presented. If common sense is applied, common prudence exerted, and common honesty exhibited in dealing with these great issues, the vision which I have presented may become a living fact to the benefit of the world and may lead by example to the removal of some of the dangers of war which now threaten so many of the so-called Christian states of Europe.

Never before have any five men been charged with greater responsibility than has been imposed upon the Commission appointed by the President to ascertain in which nation is vested the title to a small section of South America; nor has a greater opportunity of promoting human welfare ever been presented. No man can be entitled to the first rank among judges, statesmen, or students who cannot define and establish the rights in this case under the strictest rules which govern the practice of law; and this without even the threat of an appeal to force. In the progress of this simple investigation, the functions of the Commission may be extended so as to remove all causes of danger of such a crime against liberty and humanity as a war among the English-speaking people would be. It may happen that it will fall to this Commission to initiate measures to secure the benefits of Anglo-American law and to establish peace and order throughout both the continents of America. It is certain that under its learned and able adjudication the mere partisans who have been making use of the vague and uncertain ideas about the Monroe Doctrine to provoke antagonism in the minds of the mass of the people, will be deprived of what has been a dangerous weapon in their hands. While the purpose of the jingo faction in the Senate and House has been mere party suc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cess or personal notoriety, the object of the President, whatever exception may be taken to his method, cannot be questioned. If the end shall even approach the conditions of peace and reunion for all righteous purposes of the several branches of the English-speaking people which I have prescribed, the temporary discredit and disaster to which we have lately been subjected will be as dust in the balance when weighed against the progress in human welfare which will ensue.

In the treatment of this question I have been obliged to indulge in some repetition in order that the case might be presented from every point of view; yet I must submit a summary of the whole argument.

The jingo type originated in England, where there is, or was, a small class imbued with the same animosity against the United States that is manifested by a faction of our own people against England, but for very different reasons. The sympathies of many of the Tory landlords and others of England were with the slave-holders of the South during our civil war. The working people with a true instinct sustained the cause of the North and forbade the jingo faction from taking any hostile action against us. These jingoists of England had some reason for their fears. They dreaded the attack upon their privileges which was certain to follow upon our success in maintaining the Union and in establishing our abundant product. That product is assured by the application of free and intelligent labor to lightly taxed lands which are free of rent. We have redressed the wrongs which they would have done us, had they possessed the power, by bombarding British ports with unlimited supplies of wheat, corn, and cotton. The working-men who sustained our cause have had an assured abundance of cheap bread, but the rent on which the Tory landlord depended at the cost of cheap bread has disappeared. Without a hostile shot we have shorn the jingoists of their greatest power, while rendering assistance to our friends. We may be as fully assured at the present time that the men of England who are now endowed with the suffrage to a degree never enjoyed before, hold the dominant power. They will never permit the commerce which supplies them with our food and fibre to be destroyed, nor will they submit themselves again to the high cost of the necessaries of life which the jingo policy would bring upon them.

The number of persons occupied for gain in tnis country during the past ten years has averaged in excess of twenty million—a little over one in three of the whole population. Of that number one-half have depended for their subsistence either upon the direct cultivation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the farm or upon the conversion of crude farm products into their secondary form of dressed meats, canned provisions, flour and dairy products. The number dependent upon agriculture has been in excess of ten million persons. Bearing in mind that these products of agriculture which are exported are in greater measure products of labor sustained by very moderate capital, rather than products of large factories employing relatively a less number of persons and a greater amount of capital, it is perfectly certain that the exports of this country during the last ten years have given employment on the average to one million and a half persons, mostly men employed upon the fields, and probably to nearer two million. The destruction of international commerce or its interruption, especially the interruption of our commerce with Great Britain, would at once deprive a great number out of this vast force of their customary occupation and means of subsistence. That privation would immediately act upon the entire products of agriculture, reducing prices to less than cost and depriving nearly every branch of agriculture of any profit. But the evil would not end at that point. The prosperity of the railways and of the manufacturers, whose chief market is among the farmers and those engaged in the conversion of farm products, would be instantly impaired. Although the prices of a few articles might be extravagantly raised by the obstruction to imports, the great mass of our industries would be paralyzed and brought to a state of extreme depression.

Hence it follows that there can be no conceivable justification for a jingo policy of aggression, violence, and force, and no possible justification for war among the English-speaking people except in absolute defence of our own territory, our own institutions, and our own liberties.

The adjudication of land titles, the arbitration of other matters of contention, and the other suggestions made in this paper have been urgently pressed upon men in high power and position both in Great Britain and in this country. We are now making history with great rapidity; and, since the danger to which the jingo element in both countries has subjected us has been disclosed, this noisy, blatant, but really feeble faction may have been suppressed even before this essay is published, and either deprived of any influence upon public affairs or relegated to lasting contempt and obscurity by the aroused common sense of the great body of the English-speaking people.

EDWARD ATKINSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN ALLIANCE WITH ENGLAND THE BASIS OF A RATIONAL FOREIGN POLICY.

DURING the last few years the foreign relations of the United States have been brought sharply and continuously into view. The Hawaiian revolutions raised the question of the annexation of remote territory. The emergence of Japan, through her war with China, into the circle of the great modern Powers has made it necessary to consider a possible menace to our power and to our peace in the Pacific. The Armenian massacres have brought up the question of the defence of our citizens engaged in peaceful occupations in foreign countries. The Cuban rebellion forces upon our attention our relations with European states having colonies in America, and revives interest in a possible question of territorial annexation. The boundary dispute between Venezuela and England has led us to take active measures toward the assertion of the so-called "Monroe Doctrine." Under the pressure of these events we are studying to discover the rational basis of a foreign policy which shall be rooted in our history and, at the same time, consonant with the needs of our future growth.

We have a traditional foreign policy. Its cardinal doctrines are two: avoidance of entanglement in European disputes, and prevention of European aggression in America. The basis of this policy has been a profound instinctive sense of the isolation of America. Our geographical, political, and economic separateness has been one of our commonest and most persistent traditions. Our national consciousness is thoroughly imbued with it. It has been an unchallenged assumption in our argument and in our conduct. But the question is now somewhat rudely thrust upon us, "Is this isolation a fact?" There is grave doubt whether we can continue to look upon America as a continent divided from the rest of the world. If in fact this isolation does not exist, can the United States draw boundary lines along arbitrary meridians in the Atlantic and the Pacific and assert that European and Asiatic Powers shall respect these boundaries and consent to be ruled by us in matters affecting their relations with American states?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These two cardinal rules of our policy have somewhat the vagueness of traditions. There has been no clear understanding of the limits of their application. They have received no generally accepted formulation. And they have never been recognized by European governments as resting upon anything other than our national power. The aim of this paper is to show that, while in their origin they were the outgrowth of economic and political conditions, the industrial development of the last three quarters of a century has destroyed this isolation of America, and that the pressure of our economic progress is forcing upon us a new policy.

The assertion of our intention to prevent European aggression in America was entirely natural during our early national life. European colonial policy had been one of constant exploitation and arbitrary government. Even English colonies for a century and more before 1776 had been forced to fight out again the old English right of self-rule. The war policy of George III not only lost him his American colonies, but it stamped upon the American character an almost ineffaceable distrust of England. It is in vain that England has since become, in some respects, more democratic than the United States. The vision which met our infant eyes of the armed heel of England descending upon our cradle always rises first. England is to us still a tyrant,—a greedy and ruthless conqueror.

We were democratic a century ago because we had approximated an equality in economic opportunity—a new country, where each man had a free field for his ability. The fact existed of a possible high standard of life for all classes. Individualism, equality, were the chief products of the soil. We became passionately devoted to the doctrines of liberty and equality. Having won our national independence, we had active sympathy with struggling democracy everywhere. We welcomed the democratic ideas of France. In spite of the excesses of the French Revolution, so repugnant to our national character, the party with French sympathies remained very powerful. We thoroughly believed that a monarch must be a despot and that liberty could exist only under a democratic form of government. Our conviction was deep and honest that America was destined to be the refuge of liberty, —the asylum for the oppressed of all nations. It was here in this new world, separated from Europe by the great ocean, that the world's salvation from despotism was to be wrought out. These are sentiments which still remain—woven into all the tissues of American national life. Europe, to-day, forgets this. Europe does not under-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stand us because Europe does not see the power of this sentiment—the passion with which we hold to the principle of equality and to the spread of democratic institutions. We are French in our ideality. The reason why we have not made shipwreck of our democratic state is that we have held tenaciously to the ideal of a free equality—equality not merely before the law, but equality in economic opportunity. The determination to preserve a part of the world where this democracy might persist and grow has been a necessary element in the character of every American. The Monroe Doctrine is not the fundamental principle. It was simply a particular assertion, under special circumstances, of that deeper spirit of Americanism. At a time when it seemed as if the Holy Alliance were to combine all Europe in a backward movement toward absolute monarchical government, we uttered our protest that, on the American continent at least, there should be soil where democratic institutions might grow. In sympathy for Spanish colonies struggling to independence we asserted it for them. In the belief that the future of democratic institutions demanded our success, we asserted, as a right of self-preservation, that extension of European conquest in this country should cease.

But while the Monroe Doctrine was simply a particular protest under special circumstances, it has acquired a kind of authority because it was the earliest important assertion of the principle. In subsequent assertions we have naturally appealed to this Doctrine as authority. But it has no real authority. The truth is that the principle asserted in it is much wider and deeper than the Monroe Doctrine, and that instead of being obsolete it is a very important element in our national life.

The other tradition as to our foreign policy finds its first authoritative expression in Washington's Farewell Address of 1796. I say authoritative, meaning only that this Address has the authority which came from the weight of Washington's name and the inherent sound sense of the principle. He says substantially that our national prosperity depends upon the peaceful pursuit of industry, that we must keep aloof from European political disputes, because otherwise we shall be dragged into their quarrels and their wars. These two principles—the avoidance of entanglement in European politics and the opposition to European aggression in America—were eminently wise, conservative, and peace-promoting principles. They were complementary parts of a policy which had two main objects,—one political and the other economic. We wanted opportunity in America for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peaceful development of democratic principles and institutions; opportunity also for the peaceful development of our industries. In the last century we had already begun to dream of our future industrial greatness. Many men of Washington's time, and none more clearly than he, had seen beyond the Alleghanies. Already the necessity of good roads and of canals to reach the Western country had become evident. President Jefferson, putting to sleep his political conscience on the point of exceeding the constitutional rights of the Federal Government, negotiated the Louisiana purchase. Thinking men saw the manifest economic destiny which had begun to push us to the Pacific. We wanted peace—profound peace,—for we had a gigantic industrial task before us.

The industrial and commercial development of this century have changed many of the essential conditions of our national life. If we are to remain true to our principles—the promotion of democratic government, of peace, and of our economic prosperity—we must face these changed conditions and alter the letter of our policy to gain the ends for which the policy was established. Steam-navigation has so reduced the size of the world that we are no longer isolated. England to-day could more easily wage war against us than against Germany. She could transport her troops to Canada in as short a time as was required, early in the century, to place Wellington's army in Spain. The only effective barrier to-day against Europe or Asia is a powerful fleet. Mere width of ocean is no longer sufficient against any nation with a stronger navy than our own.

Now this isolation, due to the vast ocean distance between us and Europe, was the great fact which lay at the bottom of our traditional foreign policy of isolation. Asia did not figure in the problem, for we had not realized the meaning of our westward extension until the settlement of California after the gold discoveries. A narrow stretch of thinly populated country along the Atlantic seaboard, the United States looked upon the ocean as a providential bulwark against the political systems and military force of Europe. We declared that our business was, not to meddle with European affairs, but to cross the Alleghanies and make an industrial conquest of the West. Had industrial conditions remained what they were in the first quarter of the century, our effective conquest would not now have reached beyond the Mississippi and our traditional policy would still be wise. The same power, however, which has destroyed our military isolation, has brought us into the closest economic relations with Europe and with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the rest of the world. Steam-navigation, steam-railroads, and steam-power in manufacturing have made nations in every part of the world actually dependent upon each other for the necessaries of daily life. The industrial structure of modern society pays little heed to national boundaries, or geographical distances. The world to-day is small and compact. No nation is or can be isolated. Not only Europe, but Asia and Africa as well, have developed close commercial connections with the United States and other American nations. The ocean is not a barrier to transportation of goods, but has become the great highway of the world's commerce.

Slowly, but inevitably, our affairs are becoming intermingled with the affairs of other nations. English and Continental capitalists are owners of our industries to an enormous extent. The financial operations of our Government are greatly dependent upon the European money market. If we mingle with the nations we must act with them. The Great Powers will not forever make an exception of us and let us pursue our own independent courses. Hawaii and the war between Japan and China have already given hints that we shall be forced into the international disputes of Eastern Asia. Our isolation is breaking down. We are in this new world which the inventions of this century have created. We have largely created it ourselves. And this new world, made by new industrial powers, we must live in, as a necessary and an influential part of it.

There is another force pushing us out into the world's councils —the necessity of protecting the lives, the property, and the liberties of our citizens in different parts of the world. Missionary zeal, the desire to travel, the necessities of foreign residence for commercial purposes, the international pursuit of science, are more and more spreading American citizens throughout other lands. In Armenia at present the facts are such that our people might easily have been persuaded to join with other nations in armed intervention.

Another and more particular fact is forcing us away from our traditional policy. The work of the industrial subjugation of the West has been accomplished, in its large outlines. The process which began with the national road to the Ohio, with the Chesapeake and Ohio canal, and the Erie canal, was continued by the steam-railroad. Slavery was a powerful force, pushing westward in its rivalry with free-labor in the North. The war with Mexico gave us the Pacific coast. The gold discoveries settled the coast. The civil war not only destroyed the system of labor which would have disastrously

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hindered our progress but it brought the railroads to the Pacific and knit the Pacific coast into close economic and political unity with the East. Even the fanatic anachronism of the Mormon faith contributed to the building up of the industrial structure of the continent. To-day the whole country is vitally connected in its commercial life. The first agricultural occupation of the soil has been mainly finished. The great lines of transportation have been located and put into operation. Manufacturing of every sort is rapidly developing. The period of extensive occupation is over. The period of intensive development is begun. The statistics of the last twenty years show plainly how rapidly the process of internal development is going on—and also how rapidly we are reaching out in foreign trade. Our new navy is another indication of the same sort. While our agricultural development was engrossing our attention a powerful navy was largely an unnecessary expense. The development of our manufactures will necessitate the building up of an extensive foreign commerce. Instinctively, rather than consciously, our people have felt this and have supported with growing enthusiasm the policy of building up a strong navy and of promoting the growth of an American merchant marine. Merchants and manufacturers are arousing to the necessity of securing more direct governmental recognition and are urging the establishment of a Department of Manufactures and Commerce.

Our industrial forces cannot be confined within the bounds of our own land. If our old political ideas and the necessities of our economic growth come into conflict the former must yield. Economic forces shape and change the politics of nations. The pressure of our commercial expansion is becoming irresistible. The danger is that it may take the form of territorial annexation—that we shall try to extend the name of America to un-American portions of the earth. The plain fact is that under modern conditions nations cannot be powerful without international trade. The wider the trade the more efficiently can productive power be used. Modern manufactures cannot be effectively carried on without materials brought from every quarter of the earth and a market as wide for the finished product.

International trade brings a share in international politics. We have the best combination of economic resources in the world as the basis of national greatness. This clear destiny can never be realized unless we push our strength actively out into the world. We started in our national life believing in the industrial greatness and growth in store for us, and believing in the future spread of free institutions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We believed that we were to guard this continent against backsliding into absolute government. The two cardinal doctrines in our foreign policy were formulated under conditions radically different from the present. To preserve the form of these doctrines and lose their real meaning would be folly. If we are to seek henceforth the peaceful promotion of our industrial development and the growth of free governments, we must adopt new methods fitted to the changed conditions. We must realize that our industrial greatness and its due growth are to be won in the future by an aggressive foreign commerce. Active rivalry with other trading nations is a necessity if we are to continue our development. This active rivalry will bring us into grave dangers. We shall be in danger of making commercial enemies who may easily be turned into mortal foes. In particular, we are likely to come into an active rivalry with England. Facing these facts, it is necessary that we should adopt a positive, far-reaching policy, which should be made, as it were, a part of our unwritten Constitution. This policy, I am firmly convinced, should be *friendship and alliance with England.*

In the present state of feeling it would not be a difficult matter to negotiate a treaty between England and the United States which would, for example, recognize the essential principle of the Monroe Doctrine on the one hand and on the other pledge England the support of the United States, in such measures of intervention as might be necessary, in the matter of the Armenian troubles. This would be the announcement of a new policy. It would be a notice to the world that henceforth all English-speaking peoples might be expected to act together in great questions affecting their interests or in the suppression of savagery.

If we really wish to promote good government and free institutions, no better way can be devised than to push English influences. England to-day under the form of a monarchy is one of the most democratic countries in the world and the masses of her people are thorough believers in self-government. Wherever her colonies are established, the principle of self-government is established. Wherever she occupies another country—as in Egypt—justice in the courts, good order in life and in business, and sound finance are secured. The English are a hard-headed people, capable of little sentimentality, but they do more for the best interests of the people they forcibly rule, than these people can possibly do for themselves. As believers in democratic government we ought to welcome English influence throughout the world.

We would not be promoting true democracy in opposing the peaceful extension of English government in Spanish America. I, for one,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would rather see English colonial government in Cuba, than to see Cuba belong to the United States. And I hold this opinion, not only on grounds of the general progress of settled industry and good order, but as an American patriot. What could we do with Cuba? We could not admit the Cuban population, unused to our ideas of government and untrained in true political self-control, to the franchise. Cuba could not safely become one of our States, at least not until the island were half-peopled by Americans. But English colonial government—since she learned the lesson our Revolution taught her—has been moderate and wise. Her colonists of English blood have all the home rule they wish. And they are the men who dominate the other races and teach them the arts of industry, of good order, of commercial and financial honesty, of disciplined warfare when war is necessary. The Cubans would under our control be given self-government and a voice in our own government long before they were ready for it. Under English rule they would be wisely governed until they showed themselves capable of self-government.

If we had any place in our governmental system for colonies, the case would be different. But colonies have no place in our Constitution. Annexation of remote territory, or of near territory containing populations thoroughly different in race and in ideas, would mean the breaking down of our political system. The permanent existence of territories or colonies is no part of our policy. We have but one idea—the speedy growth into States of all our territorial possessions. But every State has a voice in the government of the Union. It would be fatal to admit to Statehood populations thoroughly alien. What we want now, as always, is peace—the opportunity for the development of our resources and of free government. The alliance of England and the United States would be one of the strongest possible guarantees of the world's peace. To attack this alliance would mean to attack at once the strongest navy in the world and the country which could furnish unlimited men of the best fighting quality and with inexhaustible economic resources behind them. It would be folly for any Power short of united Europe to attack at once the whole English-speaking world—a folly which Europe would not be likely to commit.

It should also be remembered that this spirit of co-operation would unite the peoples of the earth most advanced in industrial development. England's financial system controls in the commercial operations of the world. English capital supports the industry of a very large proportion of the civilized countries. Her ships carry the world's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

goods. The United States have resources, only slightly touched as yet, for the production of raw material of countless manufactures. Our supplies of coal, oil, and gas, our water-power now available for electric power, the manufacturing skill of our people, and the unsurpassed ability of our organizers of enterprise promise us speedily the first place among the manufacturing nations. With this as a necessary concomitant goes a corresponding expansion of our commerce. The British Empire and the United States acting together would literally control the industries and the commerce of the world. Add to this the probable fact that the states of Central and South America would for the most part join with us in an alliance which guaranteed the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, the combination would be absolutely irresistible. England could then afford to view her isolation in Europe with indifference. Holding the direction of the world's economic resources in our grasp we could compel the world's peace.

The promotion of the highest economic civilization yet attained would result from this policy. The English-speaking peoples have led all others in industrial development. The invention of better machines and processes, the most efficient organization of the forces of labor and capital, the maintenance of the order and security necessary to progressive industry, the principles of business honesty, the improved mechanism of finance, the individual liberty necessary to stimulate the highest productive enterprise—these are all evidences of the natural and historical supremacy of the English-speaking peoples. Industrial progress requires the friendly co-operation of England and the United States—a settled policy of friendship.

But what becomes of the Monroe Doctrine if we thus join hands with England and invite her to push her influence in America? The economic growth of the other American nations is our gain as well as theirs, for we would have an ever growing commerce with people whose economic resources were always increasing. We cannot colonize. England can, and English rule means economic growth. Similarly the extension of English trade, the settling of English people throughout the republics of America, is a gain to us. They promote settled enterprise and this improves the basis of our own trade relations with them.

It is out of my province to discuss questions of international law as such, yet I shall venture to suggest the basis of a treaty which would be better than the formal assent of England to the Monroe Doctrine. The principle should be that in all cases of dispute between American

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

states—other than the United States—and any non-American nation, the United States and England should each reserve the right to intervene should either of them deem its interests threatened or should injustice be threatened to such American states. This would give England the opportunity to exclude undue extension of other foreign influence than her own in America and it would give us the admitted right to oppose all aggression in America whether from England or from other nations. And this would commit us to no narrow limitation of the American principle, as the formal affirmance of the historical Monroe Doctrine would. This would enable us in many ways to help forward the peaceable extension of English influence in America, as well as our own, while it would furnish an absolute guarantee of protection to the American states from European or Asiatic agressions.

If once we could unite in a co-operating spirit in this way undoubtedly much of the misunderstanding and smouldering enmity now existing would be removed. We should also acquire a strong, if silent, voice in the control of English policy. She would find it necessary to study us, our ideas, and our temper. She might often be kept from rash action by the knowledge that she could not carry our people with her in some aggressive stroke. To keep our aid she would be obliged to keep our confidence. In this way, without the necessity of an overgrown navy or a burdensome army, we could make our public conscience felt the world over.

We have reached, let me restate it, a critical time in our economic development. We have occupied the ground which lay within our grasp, and have built throughout its length and breadth the framework of our industrial structure. Our future development, the intensive utilization of these resources, can only come by a rapid growth of new manufactures and by a swiftly expanding commerce. Already our manufactures are rivalling those of the strongest manufacturing peoples. Already our foreign commerce is becoming one of the most important of the world. We face an alternative where our choice cannot long be delayed—the alternative of active friendship or of avowed hostility to England. She is our greatest rival in manufactures and in commerce. If we be not for her we must be against her. If our present attitude be maintained our success will be won only as we defeat her. Step by step we must drive her from the field. As to the ultimate result of this contest there can be little doubt. Our natural resources are indefinitely greater than hers. In our industrial qualities we are Englishmen. In such a struggle resources and numbers will win. We can humiliate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

England and at last annihilate her economic supremacy, if we choose. Are we ready to do this? Is it our best policy to engage in a death struggle with the foremost nation of the world in economic civilization and moral life, as the means to our own success? The English people have done this before. England's supremacy over Holland two centuries ago was won by just such a struggle. And as then, so now, this intense commercial rivalry will inevitably involve wars. We shall become embittered more and more against each other until upon some trivial provocation we shall fight. Because we have the same blood we shall fight. We both belong to a race that brooks no permanent rival. Are we ready to drift into an irreconcilable hostility toward England? Are we ready to repeat the ignoble acts of the English and, after a century, more or less, of bitter commercial rivalry, to destroy with ships and armies the pride of our mother-country and sink her into another Holland?

On the other hand, we have nothing to lose by an avowed and positive friendship with England. The more of her capital we have to develop our enterprises, the better off we are. The more we buy of her manufactures, the better market we have for our foods. What is needed is first of all an attempt at friendly co-operation. Let this once be established and it would be easy from time to time to negotiate treaties and to pass such laws that there might be a division of the field which would leave to each that in which each was the stronger. The free flow of capital from one country to the other would enable the people of each nation to share the advantages of both. A permanent court to settle disputes between the two peoples might easily be established as a new bond.

This combination would undoubtedly be regarded by the rest of the world as an instrument of oppression. The justification of it is only that it would be a combination of those forces, economic, political, and ethical, which are historically foremost and which make most strongly for progress in civilization. This is an arrogant pretension; but history justifies it. By a firm union between all English-speaking peoples, their supremacy in industrial methods, in free government, and in moral living would be made unassailable. To live with us the rest of the world would be forced to live like us. And that is a fair definition of progress.

SIDNEY SHERWOOD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EUROPEAN SITUATION.

THE year 1895 cannot be said to have been an auspicious one for Europe. Apart from the internal troubles of the different states, and such special ones as the defeat of Italy in Abyssinia; the serious civil war in Cuba, which must lead to Spain's bankruptcy; and the intervention of Russia, France, and Germany in Japanese affairs,—the so-called "Eastern Question" has assumed alarming proportions, and the European Powers which dabbled in it have made a fine mess of Mr. Gladstone's "unspeakable Turk." Yet that ominous question may be comprehended in a nut-shell.

Islam is not so much a religion as a culture. The Koran which is its sole basis, as an inspired book and in spite of its many contradictions rules the whole life of the Muslim,—laying down the laws of matrimony, of inheritance, and of evidence, as well as those relating to morals and prayers. The Turks, issuing as a conquering race from interior Asia, adopted Islam wholesale. There has never been a Christian state in the sense that the Turkish Empire is a Mussulman state. As to the non-Mussulmans, the Koran makes a sharp distinction between the heathen—who are to be destroyed unless they adopt Islam—and the possessors of a scriptural or revealed religion, such as that of the Christians and Jews. These latter are to be subjected, and, as a token of their subjection, are to pay a poll-tax.[1] They are to have no rights, but are not to be persecuted because of their religion. In fact the Turkish conquerors confirmed the position of the different Christian patriarchs. To only one exception the Christians had to submit: every five years a *razzia* was made among their youth, their finest boys were taken, were given a strict monk-like Mussulman education, and, when adult, formed the kernel of the Turkish army—the Janizaries. The second distinguishing feature of the Turkish Empire was that of a great feudal monarchy. The power of the Byzantine rule had been reduced long before it fell to a shadow. The country was in fact governed by greater and smaller chieftains, the Dereg-Begs and Timarlis. These the Turks left undisturbed on

[1] Koran, Sura II. The Repentance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

condition that they furnished a certain military contingent, and paid tithe to the Sultan; otherwise they enjoyed perfect autonomy. It was the addition of these contingents to the Turkish army that enabled the Turks, not in themselves so numerous, to conquer Asia Minor, Egypt, and the Balkan peninsula, and to carry their armies to the gates of Vienna.

Then the flood began to recede. In a series of unfortunate wars the Porte lost most of its conquests, and the great feudatories took advantage of this weakness of the central power to render themselves nearly independent. Mahmud II became the reformer, after having destroyed the Janizaries—who had turned into a Pretorian band, deposing and enthroning Sultans,—and having, with the help of Moltke, created an army, he fell upon the Dereg-Begs, annihilated them, and with a stroke of the pen confiscated all the property of the Timarlis. This measure had fatal consequences, for while the administration of the feudatories was perhaps not exemplary, on the whole it answered the local wants. Now, however, it was replaced by a centralized bureaucracy of Pashas, Mutessarifs, etc., appointed by the Sultan; and what rendered this measure still more calamitous was the introduction of the *Iltizam*,—the farming out of the provincial taxes to the highest bidder. Thus greedy functionaries bought their places at Constantinople and, being always subject to recall, tried to squeeze double taxes out of the unfortunate provinces. The taxes, therefore, were oppressive, corruption flourished and the country, notwithstanding its rich resources, became impoverished.

Now the European powers, when beginning, by external complications, to meddle with the internal affairs of Turkey, have hitherto put the wrong wedge in the wrong place. What they ought to have insisted upon, and what at times they were quite able to insist upon,—as, for instance, the two Western powers during the Crimean war,—was a reform of the administration; the abolition of the farming out of taxes; fixity of tenure for government officials, and the appointment of capable men sufficiently paid; and a system of rational taxation, so that the grievances under which Turks and Christians equally suffered would be removed. Instead of that they pressed the Porte to proclaim equality of rights for all its subjects; they insisted that Christians no longer be subjected to the degrading poll-tax, but should be allowed to serve in the army; and that the evidence of Christians should be accepted in the courts equally with that of Mussulmans,—and so on. Now a strong non-Mussulman power—such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as England in India or Austria in Bosnia—may compel Mohammedans to submit to such conditions, however distasteful they may be (Austria, for instance, has been obliged to refer civil affairs to separate courts, leaving only religious questions to the Mussulman judges); but a Mohammedan monarch will never sincerely countenance reforms which are subversive of the whole culture of Islam. The Porte, indeed, pressed by the Powers, has several times promised to introduce the above-mentioned equality, but has never carried out its promises,—not only because of a tendency to bad faith, but because such reforms would be resisted by its Mussulman subjects, for the lowest beggar who humbly asks a present from the Christian traveller still regards the latter as an infidel dog. Islam is a stationary power. It has no conception of what we call modern progress. Mussulmans may use the railways which the English or Germans build in their countries, but their culture remains the same.

Now in the latest complication three of the leading Powers—England, Russia, and France—have again adhered to the false idea of equality; the only difference being that it was demanded in favor of a special Christian community—the Armenians. The latter are an ancient race, but were ever divided under different sovereigns. There are now two millions of Armenians in the Russian Caucasus; but in Asia Minor they form an extremely small minority—15 per cent—of the population. Even in the province of Sivas, where they are most numerous, they number 17,000 and the Mussulmans 840,000. They are also divided as to their creed, about 75 per cent being Gregorians, 15 per cent Protestants, and 10 per cent Catholics,—all hating each other bitterly. Now under such conditions and inasmuch as the Armenians are not segregated, but are interspersed among Mussulmans and Christians of other denominations, Is it possible to apply the principle of autonomy? Yet this is what England, under the pressure of the revolutionary Armenian committee in London, and supported by Russia and France, has asked. Russia's support is due to the fact that she is always glad to give trouble to the Porte, though at the same time she secretly exercises a retarding influence, and presents herself to the Sultan as his true protector. Under the pretext of restoring order, Russia would like to take another slice of Anatolia, but she will never countenance an autonomous Armenia, which might form a nucleus of attraction for her own Armenians and become a second Bulgaria. As to France, she simply here, as everywhere, submissively follows in the wake of Russia. The three Powers finally extorted a reform *irade* for six Anatolian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

provinces, the immediate consequence of which was the plunging of the country into a frightful civil war. Mussulman fanaticism was aroused, Armenians were slaughtered by wholesale, and they in turn retaliated, as for instance in Zeitun. Reform thus remains a dead letter.

Much has been said of Lord Salisbury's speech at the Mansion House. I think it was an exceedingly poor performance. The noble Lord, following in the path of his predecessor, had used strong language against the Porte. He was even inclined, last August, to send an ultimatum to Constantinople, and to follow it up by the English fleet; but he prudently abstained from this action when Russia hinted that in such an event she would be obliged to occupy Erzeroum. Lord Salisbury then threw himself upon the concert of the great Powers, which, as he thought, had never been stronger than at present. That concert has shown itself in only one instance,—the demand, by the Powers, for additional guardships for their embassies, a demand which was at last granted by the Sultan after an audience to the Russian Ambassador. Otherwise, the European concert has given no sign of life. The Triple Alliance prudently keeps back, Russia wishes the present condition of affairs to continue because it undermines the stability of Turkey; and England, isolated, yet not wishing to sever her relations with the other Powers, can do nothing. Lord Salisbury has adopted other tactics by publicly reading a letter addressed to him by the Sultan, and commenting upon it in an unusually harsh way. Now it is quite true that the misgovernment at Constantinople is scandalous, and the constantly changing ministers have no power. The Sultan wants to decide everything himself, but acts on the advice of favorites, astrologers, and the like.

But Lord Salisbury has also a special and very material grievance against the Sultan, which is not generally known. The English wish to construct a railway from Port Said to the Persian Gulf,—a route which would become the shortest way to India. But the Sultan, considering that he has quite enough of the English in Egypt, refuses to grant a concession for a road through Turkish Arabia. In this he is supported by Russia, which has no desire to facilitate England's access to the Persian Gulf; and, the railway having also to cross internal Arabia, inhabited by independent tribes, a Russian agent persuaded the Sheik of Iman, the ruler of the most powerful of these tribes, also to refuse the passage, so that the plan now seems hopeless.[1]

[1] For the knowledge of this fact I am indebted to a German scientific traveller, just returned from Arabia.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The British Premier hopes that another Sultan may be more pliable, but this is doubtful. Meanwhile Russia protects the present ruler, having found a golden key to the Palace, for which Abdul-Hamid has, notwithstanding his financial stress, shown his gratitude by sending Arif Pasha with precious gifts to the Czar. No matter which way she turns, England finds herself at Constantinople in a blind alley.

I need not discuss at length the Venezuelan question, which blocks England's path in another region, but I avow that I cannot take an optimistic view of it. It is all very well to say that a war between England and the United States would be fratricidal, but we must reckon with facts as they stand. Whatever one thinks of President Cleveland's Message, the American Boundary Commission is constituted, and, even if it works slowly, consulting all the materials of the different archives, it must come to some result as to what the proper frontier should be. England, on the other hand, having refused arbitration within the Schomburgk line, would not readily accept a one-sided American decision, unless it concurred with that line. A general arbitration by independent great Powers, suggested by Mr. Stanley in the January "Nineteenth Century," seems to have little chance, as such Powers would not care to accept the responsibility, nor would the United States consent to what would be the reverse of the Monroe Doctrine, namely, settling an American dispute by European intervention. Nor must we omit to reckon with the bitter feeling against England which, as Mr. Stanley states, he has found everywhere in his late trip in the United States,—a feeling so general that, according to his view, the President's Message was only an echo of it. Mr. Stanley writes:—

> "It was no electoral dodge as at first believed by us, it was no jingoist impulse or courting of the Irish vote, but the expression of American sentiment and American conviction. We shall be equally wrong, also, if we think that any partiality for Venezuela has inspired the President's utterances. The United States seems not to claim to know which party is wrong or right, the boundary dispute is of trivial importance, except as it is the cause of the greater issue, namely, the right of the American people to speak with authority in all questions affecting the integrity of American states."

Now, given these facts, I confess I cannot see a way out of the difficulty compatible with the honor and the interests of the litigant parties.

All these questions, weighty as they are, seem, however, to be thrown into the background by events in the Transvaal and by what is called German intervention. The facts of this case are so persistently perverted by the English press that I must state them as they are.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1801 the English conquered Cape Colony from Holland—which, by the invasion of Napoleon, was unwillingly thrown into the ranks of England's enemies—and kept the colony at the peace of 1815. Besides the indigenous population of Kaffirs, Zulus, and other tribes, they found there the Dutch settlers,—the Boers,—a sturdy race which had colonized a great part of the country. But in time the colony expanded: in 1843 Natal was annexed; in 1866, Kaffraria; in 1868, Basutoland, and so on,—the riches of those parts attracting many foreign colonists. In 1853 a foolish constitution was granted to the colony, giving the franchise to the colored races—who were mere savages—as well as to the whites. The Boers, seeing that in this way their majority over the English would be turned into a minority, emigrated northward, founding the colony of the Orange Free State and later that of the Transvaal. In 1875–6, Lord Carnarvon went to the Cape in order to bring the jarring and discordant elements of South Africa under one common administration. But though his scheme was conceived in a spirit of moderation, it proved abortive. Apathy on the part of the British colonists, sullenness and defiance on the part of the Boers, restlessness and rebellion among the numerous offshoots of the great Bantu race on the eastern frontiers, made futile all attempts to realize the plan. The principal interests had shifted in some degree from the south to the north, and the Transvaal, holding the key to the situation, tried to form a connection with the Portuguese settlement at Delagoa Bay. In order to prevent this, the British Government, by a lawless *coup*, annexed the Transvaal in 1877; but in 1881 the Boers rose against their invaders, and at Laing's Neck and Majuba Hill inflicted upon them the most ignominious defeats that British troops ever suffered. Mr. Gladstone yielded, and by the treaty of August 3, 1881, the Transvaal recovered its independence, subject to certain rights of the British crown reserved by Article II, which might be termed suzerainty, although that term was not used. But, precisely for this reason, that treaty was rejected by the Transvaal Volksraad, and in a new treaty of February 27, 1884, Article II was omitted, the country took its old name of South African Republic, and the powers of the British Government were by Article IV restricted to a right to veto treaties with foreign powers and African populations, except the Orange Free State, on the express condition that such veto must be exercised within six months after such treaties had been communicated to the English Government.

It was under these circumstances that the treaty of commerce

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and amity of January 22, 1895, was concluded between Germany and the South African Republic, in which the latter declares that it wished this treaty after having secured its independence. England exercised its veto when the newly founded Boer states Stellaland, Goshen, and Nieuve Republic wished to come under the protectorate of the Transvaal; and she annexed all the country between the latter and German West Africa, so that the South African Republic was everywhere surrounded by British territory, except the one outlet through Portuguese Africa to Delagoa Bay, through which, notwithstanding English intrigues, a railway was built, principally with German capital. The recent discoveries of the gold mines at Witwatersrand attracted a great many adventurers, not only English, but of all nations, and the village of Johannesburg became a flourishing town. These "Uitlanders," as they are called, urgently demanded equal political rights with the Boers, on the ground that they paid the same taxes. This was not unjust in itself, and President Krüger was not disinclined to support these claims, although he was certainly right in proposing certain guaranties, as these adventurerers in no wise represented the flower of their nations. In any case such amendments could be made only through the prescribed constitutional forms, namely, by the sanction of the Volksraad. But what happened? A band of armed filibusters was organized in West Bechuanaland under the leadership of Dr. Jameson, a functionary of the British South Africa Company, and crossed the Transvaal frontier, declaring that they were called by their brethren, the Uitlanders, to redress their grievances. The Boers, however, were quite equal to the emergency. Their forces met the enemy at Kruegersdorp, and, after a severe struggle, routed them completely, taking Dr. Jameson and his principal officers prisoners to Pretoria.

The conduct of the British Government in this affair was blameless, for as soon as the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Chamberlain, heard of it, he telegraphed to the Governor, Sir Hercules Robinson, to stop Jameson, and the Governor issued a proclamation disclaiming for his Government any responsibility for this lawless adventure. But it seems equally certain, not only that the Prime Minister, Mr. Cecil Rhodes, knew of the proposed raid, but that Jameson was his subordinate in the Chartered Company and acted under his orders. This even the English press admits, and the proof of it is that Rhodes was compelled to resign.

Now what has the German Emperor done? So soon as he heard of the Boers' victory, he congratulated President Krüger on having, by his own energy, and without appealing to the help of friendly powers,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

successfully repelled the armed forces which had invaded his country, re-established peace, and maintained his country's independence against aggressions from without. The Emperor therefore simply congratulated the President on a fact which the British Government emphatically condemned. He in no wise interfered, but, when the invasion was imminent, had simply asked, through his ambassador at London, what measures the Government had taken to protect the German residents in the Transvaal against this aggression. Yet this message aroused in England an indignation scarcely to be comprehended. It was denounced in the most unqualified terms as a wilful insult to the British nation,—as an attempt of a foreign sovereign to interfere in a question regarding a country under English suzerainty. Now this is exactly what I must term a misrepresentation, for the South African Republic is not under English suzerainty. In the treaty of 1884, the second article of the treaty of 1881 was explicitly omitted, and the right of England was restricted to the veto mentioned above. That such is the case is confirmed by an official dispatch (February 14, 1884) of the then Colonial Secretary, Lord Derby, under whom was concluded the "Convention between Her Majesty The Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the South African Republic, of February 27, 1884."[1] It runs thus:—

"By *omitting* that article of the treaty of Pretoria of 1881, by which certain special rights to the internal and external relations of the State of Transvaal were reserved to Her Majesty and to the British Resident, liberty is left to the government of the South African Republic to administrate the country without interference, *to direct its diplomatic intercourse and foreign policy under the sole condition* mentioned in Article IV of the new treaty, that no treaty with a foreign power shall be valid without the sanction of the Queen."

Article III declares:—

"If a British officer is appointed to reside at Pretoria or elsewhere within the South African Republic, to discharge functions analogous to those of a *Consular* officer, he will receive the protection and assistance of the Republic."

Now this is clear. No state under suzerainty, such as Egypt under that of the Porte, is allowed to have diplomatic representation. Lord Derby explicitly conceded that right to the South African Republic, and in fact, since the treaty, it has had a minister-plenipotentiary at Berlin, Dr. von Blokland, who is officially mentioned as a member of the diplomatic body, just as is the ambassador of Great Britain or of France. The British representative in the Transvaal has the

[1] Blue Book C. 3914.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

official title of "diplomatic agent," and ranks with the other ministers accredited to the President. Now, if this is not independence, I know not what may be termed so. One special condition reserved to another state does not alter the fact of sovereignty. Belgium also, by the treaty of 1831 which constituted it, was forbidden to enter into treaty engagements which might jeopardize the neutral character imposed upon it, but is it therefore less a sovereign state? All the noise of the English press, then, is utterly without foundation. The Emperor has simply sent a message to the President of another independent state, congratulating him on having put down a lawless inroad of foreign adventurers. If the President had been obliged to appeal for help to friendly states, he would have had a perfect right to do so, as such a course would not involve the question of the reserved veto against a treaty. But this has not been done, and the talk of a German protectorate over the South African Republic is idle. Neither of the parties thinks of it, and the brave Boers are quite able to take care of themselves.

President Krüger, throughout the whole affair, has acted with energy and moderation. He put down the rebellion, compelled the Uitlanders at Johannesburg to disarm, and has not summarily shot Jameson and the captured prisoners, as he had a perfect right to do,—they being nothing better than pirates. On the contrary, he brought them before a court-martial and has not confirmed that court's sentence of death, but simply sent the prisoners away to Natal. The truth lying at the bottom of the excitement of British opinion is that the "mad adventure" of Jameson did not succeed because it was undertaken with totally inadequate means. If these "Elizabethan adventurers," as the "Saturday Review" calls them, had been successful in overrunning the hated Boer state, which is considered as a thorn in the side of that party which wants to rule over the whole of South Africa, they would have been overwhelmed with applause.

The present excitement will probably soon subside, but if England should be inclined to take this opportunity of provoking a quarrel with Germany, she would soon find out that Germany would not stand alone.

F. H. GEFFCKEN.

MUNICH, *January 1, 1896.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SPIRIT OF RACING IN AMERICA.

THE racing of horses in the United States became during the last quarter of a century one of our most popular forms of sport. In the aggregate many thousands of persons were attracted to the race meetings in the various parts of the country every day during the racing season, which was generally considered to begin in May and end in November. To build and equip the race-courses, to breed and train the horses that contested, required the investment of many millions of money. Hence racing as an institution became more than a sport,—it is now a vast business in which thousands of men are regularly employed. It has long been recognized, however, by the legislators in several States of the Union as a hazardous business, on account of the betting inseparable from it, and has therefore generally been regulated by special laws defining the length of the meetings and also imposing upon it a tax determined by the amount received for admissions. Until within the last ten years the associations which held race meetings in the United States were nearly always controlled by gentlemen of high social standing,—men above reproach. These men were sportsmen who contributed time and money to these ventures out of pure love for the noble sport. To them horse-racing was as much a sport as yachting is to its devotees, and the gratification of their taste was as a rule a source of outlay rather than revenue.

When racing had become so popular that great crowds could be depended upon to attend all the meetings, and when there was a great revenue from the bookmakers who paid a heavy license fee for the privilege of publicly betting on the courses, another class of men were attracted to the business, who engaged in it for the money that was to be made from the various sources of revenue. They corresponded in a great measure to the amusement purveyors who have taken possession of the theatres in America, and they have usually been designated as "sporting-men." A sporting-man is one who lives by the sport which engages his attention and he is very nearly the opposite of the sportsman. The latter is an amateur and the former is a professional: one takes an interest in racing for the love of it, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other for the profit which accrues. These terms will be used in the remainder of this article without further definition. When the sporting-men had secured the control of many small tracks in the neighborhood of such large cities as New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago, they extended the time of racing from year's end to year's end and horses were flogged through slush and snow and spurred over the frozen ground. With this kind of racing the sportsmen of the country had nothing whatever to do; on the contrary they held it in detestation and made rules for the government of associations still under their control prohibiting owners who raced their horses over these "outlaw" tracks from participating in the sport over the courses of the high-class associations.

The action of the sportsmen was not effective enough to satisfy the popular demand for reform. This desire for reform was not the outgrowth of a disgust at the cruelty of a sport persisted in out of season, but because the craze for betting on the races had become, in the opinion of the reformers, a menace to the morals of the people. Men and women who wanted to bet on the races, whether they were run in St. Louis, Chicago, New Orleans, Louisville, or in New York, did not have to go to the race tracks to lay their wagers. They could be accommodated at any one of hundreds of "pool-rooms,"—gambling places which became, by 1892, almost as numerous as the inevitable corner liquor saloon. It was the gambling that the reformers were aiming at when they secured such adverse legislation in New Jersey that racing was completely stopped in that State. It was also gambling that they opposed when they secured an amendment to the constitution in New York, placing in the fundamental law of the State an inhibition of gambling, betting, pool-selling, lotteries, and all games of chance. I shall recur to this part of my subject presently after I have traced quite briefly the history of horse-racing in America and enumerated the benefits which the country has derived from the sport.

Horse-racing as we practise it in America is of English origin, and when it first found foothold on this continent the fringe of settlements on the Atlantic seaboard were English colonies, peopled by English subjects, governed by English gentlemen. That the favorite English sport should have been transplanted here soon after the rescue of a considerable domain from the universal forest was inevitable. It was also quite natural that this sport should have been first indulged in in those sections where planting on a large scale was profitable, rather than in the more northern colonies that lived in a great measure by trade.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The first racing that we had in this country was therefore in Virginia and South Carolina; indeed the first Jockey Club established in the world was the one in South Carolina which was organized in 1734. The British Jockey Club, according to the Hon. Francis Lawley, a recognized authority, was not organized until 1750. These sportsmen in Virginia and South Carolina imported horses from England for racing and for breeding, and the blood of some of the best horses in America to-day—notably those in Kentucky—may be traced back to these pre-revolutionary thoroughbreds from across the sea.

Racing in this country, in that era and up to the end of the civil war—that is for one hundred and thirty-one years,—was distinctly the sport of gentlemen, the sportsmen controlling the race meetings and seeing that the rules were enforced. There were sporting-men even then, however, and the race-courses were favorite places at which they plied their various crafts. The games of chance to ensnare the unwary were numerous and surely profitable for the professionals. And the cock-fight was almost as much a matter of course as the bar at which the visitors could satisfy their thirst. But the games and the gambling on the races did not extend beyond the race tracks, and those who had neither time nor money to go to these places were barred from any participation in any of the various forms of sport.

Before the war of the Revolution the English officers quartered about New York had established a race-course on Long Island, and ever since then there has been racing in the neighborhood of the metropolis,—now without question the racing centre of the United States. In the old-time races there was nearly always a deal of sentiment, this often taking a sectional form,—as for instance when "Eclipse" represented the North and "Henry" the South in a race at four-mile heats on Long Island in 1823. From the journal of Josiah Quincy we learn that one hundred thousand persons were spectators of this race, and that he was so interested in the sport that he sat in the sun till one of his cheeks was blistered without at the time being conscious of the intense heat. At this race it is interesting to recall that John Randolph of Roanoke sat just in front of Mr. Quincy, who said of the Virginian:—

> "Apart from his intense sectional pride, he had personal interest at the turn things were taking; for he had bet heavily on the contest, and, it was said, proposed to sail for Europe upon clearing enough to pay his expenses."

This was after "Henry" had won the first heat. For in the next heat when "Eclipse's" proper rider, Purdy, was in the saddle, the tables

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were turned, and the race went to "Eclipse." Of the race Mr. Quincy wrote:

"There was never contest more exciting. Sectional feeling and heavy pecuniary stakes were both involved. The length of time before it was decided, the change of riders, the varying fortunes, all intensified the interest. I have seen the great Derby races; but they finish almost as soon as they begin, and were tame enough in comparison to this. Here for nearly two hours there was no abatement in the strain. I was unconscious of everything else, and found, when the race was concluded, that the sun had actually blistered my cheek without my perceiving it. The victors were of course exultant, and Purdy mounted on 'Eclipse' was led up to the judges' stand, the band playing 'See the Conquering Hero Comes.' The Southerners bore their losses like gentlemen, and with a good grace. It was suggested that the comparative chances of Adams and Jackson at the approaching Presidential election should be tested by the gathering. 'Ah,' said Mr. Randolph, 'if the question of the Presidency could be settled by this assembly there would be no opposition; Mr. Purdy would go to the White House by acclamation.'"

I quote Mr. Quincy thus at length because we are not accustomed in this country to get sporting evidence from such a source. And then again he shows that, at this historic race at least, some of our great men were interested spectators. The other historic races which are inevitably recalled when one thinks of the racing of the past are those between "Wagner" and "Grey Eagle" at Louisville, and between "Lexington" and "Lecompte" at New Orleans. All the great contests in ante-bellum days were at four-mile heats. Unless a horse could stay a distance and repeat, he was not considered worthy of any high consideration. Great speed over short distances was well in its way, but the ability to stay, with a measure of speed in reserve, was what the breeders and the trainers aimed at. And they unquestionably attained their object. In attaining it they have improved all the families of horses in those sections where breeding for racing has long been customary.

Whenever a law is made by a legislature authorizing races the preamble invariably says that the law or charter is in the interest of the improvement of the breeding of the horse. Many ignorant persons, in their opposition to racing, appear to believe that this consideration for the improvement of the horse is an empty pretence. But it is genuine in intention and admirable in result. The English horse is a very different animal from that of days previous to the era of racing; now it is likely that the horses of England are the best in the world.

In countries where racing is not a great institution the governments are obliged to maintain great breeding stables so as to mount their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cavalry. In this country, even with only a few regiments of mounted troops, it is difficult to get high class horses. Of recent years, whenever practicable, the horses for the United States cavalry are bought in the Blue Grass section of Kentucky, where pretty nearly every horse bred has in his blood some high and noble strain. Very nearly every farmer in this particular section is ambitious to breed a winner on the turf and this accounts for the universality of good blood in all the horses. It is a well-known fact that when two troops of cavalry have been sent on a hard campaign together, with one troop mounted on Kentucky horses and the other on horses say from Indiana or Ohio, the Kentucky horses have invariably worn the others completely out. This difference in endurance is one purely of blood. When the civil war began it was almost impossible to mount the cavalry of the Federal army, while the Confederate cavalry from Virginia, South Carolina, Kentucky, and Tennessee—States where horses had long been bred for racing—were very superior, and the early successes of the Confederates in the field—successes which lasted until they were very greatly outnumbered—were in a great measure due to the superiority of the mounted forces of the South. The achievements of Forrest seemed almost miraculous, while Morgan and his Kentuckians for several years went whithersoever they pleased. This was merely a matter of horses. When the Confederates invaded Pennsylvania, in that famous campaign of which Gettysburg was the climax, the artillerymen and cavalrymen could not resist the temptation to exchange their apparently worn out and half starved horses for the sleek fat animals they found on the Pennsylvania farms. It was not many days, however, before they repented the exchange in sadness. The blood of their own horses as a rule was leavened by a mixture of some strain of the thoroughbred: this gave them courage and endurance. The wretched draught-horses from the Pennsylvania farms were useless except at a moderate pace on a good road. There are those who believe, with entire sincerity, that if racing had been as generally practised in the Northern States as it was in Kentucky before the war, the war would have ended two years before it did and scores of thousands of lives been saved, together with billions of money.

There are so few people in the world who believe we will soon realize such Utopian conditions as the abolition of war that at this time we may eliminate such conditions from consideration. We may concede therefore that it is our duty to be prepared for war. We cannot make such preparations without knowing where we are to get the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

necessary horses. We cannot breed them after war is declared. There is but one way and that is to have the horses that are in general use of such a high class that they will be fit for use in the army whenever needed. It is true the Government might go into the breeding business, but I scarcely think such an idea attractive enough to discuss. Now as to raising the high standard of horses generally there has hitherto been but one way,—through the spirit of emulation and rivalry occasioned by racing. Very few persons object to racing *per se* or see anything wrong in it. Moralists generally only see wrong in it because the sport provokes betting, that is, gambling. Now those who have given the greatest attention to racing and have looked at it with the best intelligence say very frankly that we cannot possibly have racing without betting. They maintain that racing and betting are inseparable, and they moreover maintain that betting would surely survive even though racing were killed. Why kill a sport, they ask, which affords a very healthy form of out-door amusement and which leads to such splendid results in the improvement of the breed of horses, merely because men bet on races? Men will continue to bet whether there are races or not. They will bet on the rise and fall in the price of cotton, coffee, pork, wheat, corn, stocks, bonds—they will bet and do bet on every conceivable thing. So why select the one form of betting on horses and place it under the ban?

It is very much easier to ask these questions than it is to answer them, and I for one shall make no attempt, as I see no difference whatever in the morality of a transaction with a broker from that of a wager with a bookmaker. But in the constitution of the State of New York and in the statutes of many other States speculation on the result of a horse-race is put under the ban. If public opinion really coincided with this legal inhibition there could be no betting on the races; but public opinion is evidently interested only in the regulation of such gambling so that society may not become demoralized through universal participation in it. When public opinion became excited on the subject three or four years ago the betting on the races had become, in New York and many other cities, so well-nigh universal that industry was menaced and well established habits of thrift overcome. At this time, though there were race-courses accessible in every urban neighborhood, this betting was not in great measure done at the race-courses but at the pool-rooms which flourished in all sections of all cities, and which were protected by the police according to a regular schedule of blackmail. All this was demoralizing without any doubt,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and it was well to have it stopped because it was doing harm. But to stop betting on races is another matter; and it has not been stopped in the State of New York nor is it likely to be. Betting must, however, be done in a different way from of old and the only way that has been discovered—betting on credit—makes it quite impossible for those to participate in the speculation who formerly were most seriously injured by it.

Those who were interested in racing in New York went to the legislature and asked that the bills passed to make operative the constitutional prohibition against betting should be so framed that racing itself would not be attacked. Those gentlemen were listened to and three bills were passed, which have since been known as the Gray-Percy bills. In addition to prescribing heavy penalties for the doing of any act forbidden by the constitution, they stipulate that racing shall only be in the daytime and that it shall not begin earlier in the year than the middle of April nor continue longer than the middle of November. A State Racing Commission is also provided for, and each association proposing to hold running races must receive permission, in the form of a license, from this Commission. All racing must be done under the rules of the Jockey Club, and any association infringing these rules may have its license revoked. All pool selling, betting, or book-making is prohibited.

It was curious to see how these associations would get along under these laws. The bookmakers for years previous had paid $100 each per day for the privilege of making books. This meant anywhere from $2,500 to $10,000 a day to the associations, and was the most certain part of their revenue. But the bookmakers evaded the book-making prohibition as easily as possible; they did not publish the odds on slates, they did not cry them aloud, they gave no tickets as evidence of transactions, but they took the bets that were offered by men in whom they trusted and merely had a record made of the transaction by a man who stood by with a large pasteboard sheet. Then settlements were made the next day by the loser sending the winner a check for the amount of the loss. In cases where those who would bet do not have acquaintance with bookmakers they can, before the races,—preferably before going to the track,—make a deposit with the bookmaker with whom they wish to make wagers. This method of betting has been explained in an action in the Supreme Court in New York and the judge saw nothing in it opposed to either statutes or constitution. The transactions are very quickly made and they would be quite satis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

factory to those concerned except that there is as yet no place of settlement, and it is easier to "welch," without being made an object of scorn and contumely, than it is in England. On a beautiful day in the autumn of 1895 I went to Morris Park,—a well-known race-course near New York. The racing was excellent and two years before under such conditions there would probably have been 10,000 persons present. Now there were no more than 1,500 on the grounds. On inquiring of a well-known bookmaker why so few were present he informed me that the small attendance was due to the recent restrictions placed on betting.

The condition of racing affairs in New York is being carefully watched in all other parts of the country and if racing should thrive reasonably in the Empire State under the conditions imposed it is not at all unlikely that other States will enact similar laws. This would make racing conditions practically the same in the various parts of the country. Such a result would be in itself desirable. But racing under the New York conditions cannot be indulged in on so extensive a scale, for the profits from it as a business cannot be nearly so large. The restrictions to betting are such that thousands stay away from the race meetings who otherwise would go. This reduces the revenue of the associations in gate money; though the most considerable reduction is in the stoppage of license fees from the bookmakers. Under these circumstances the associations cannot afford to offer such great prizes for the horses, nor can they maintain the splendid courses recently built. These reductions limit the attractiveness of breeding and racing as businesses; but the reductions are not so considerable that breeding should become unprofitable or racing unattractive save to the sporting-men. It is not unlikely that the thoroughbred horse for breeding purposes, by reason of the extensive demand for his progeny, was valued at an unreasonably high figure. This might also be said of the brood mares. With the breeding stock valued fairly and sensibly and according to the price that racing animals will reasonably bring in the market the breeding of thoroughbreds would still be the most profitable business into which the horseman could go. Common horses are surely and steadily depreciating in value, but this is not the case with high-grade horses. The high-grade horses—notably the American trotters—are the result of a very considerable admixture of thoroughbred blood with the blood of horses comparatively common. The improvement of the general run of horses will probably be quickened if a good thoroughbred sire could be bought for a price within

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the means of others than men of wealth. To be sure it would be silly to expect to improve the generality of horses by lowering the standard of the thoroughbred. The thoroughbred must be kept pure and he *too should be improved. The inducement to keep him pure and to* improve him as an animal is that he is of value in this great and exhilarating sport.

There has been much interesting discussion of late years as to whether the thoroughbred had not deteriorated on account of the taste for, and fashion of, very short races. The tendency was undoubtedly bad, though there is much question whether it has gone far enough as yet to do any considerable harm. The Jockey Club in New York has a rule against many short races and it may be that there is an intention in this to return to the old style of long-distance heat races. But surely no reform would go backwards very far. The short races, and many of them in a day, were undoubtedly in a measure occasioned by the demand of the bookmakers that they should be given as good opportunities as possible to get back from the general bettors the money they had paid for license fees. In this way the betting hurt the improvement of the horse; now, when the associations holding meetings receive nothing from the bookmakers. all consideration for them may be disregarded.

Neither sportsmen nor sporting-men are particularly pleased with the present condition of the laws as to racing and betting. The sporting-men, if the New York laws should become universal, would be very much reduced in number. But the sportsmen, it seems to me, purely as sportsmen, would be in a better position to control and enjoy the sport to which they are attached. And moreover the thoroughbred horse, his value not inflated unreasonably, might have a better chance to do the good he is specially qualified for,—in assisting to raise the grade of horses in this country so that there would in time be none of cold blood left. But the thoroughbred will not be kept pure without racing, and racing will languish and perish if betting be absolutely stopped.

JNO. GILMER SPEED.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MANNERS AND CUSTOMS OF THE BOERS.

Of late the newspapers have teemed with news from the Transvaal Republic of South Africa, but few people really know who the Boer is and what are his antecedents. It is the intention in this article to give a short history of the race which, for years, has stood like a rock in the way of British Imperial ambition in South Africa.

The Dutch Afrikanders are of pure European blood. Banished for their Protestant faith, they still cling with childlike simplicity to the religion and customs of their forefathers. With the Bible in one hand and the rifle in the other, enduring hardships which would blanch the cheeks of the bravest men, they have been pioneers of civilization to the great hordes of natives in darkest South Africa. The originators of the present Boer (farmer) republics in South Africa were, at first, chiefly French Huguenots driven from their country by Roman Catholic persecution. A few years before they reached the Cape, or southernmost extremity of Africa, a few Hollanders had taken possession of the country and formed a settlement. Stronger than the French in loyalty to their national habits, the language and customs of the latter gradually gave way to those of the Hollanders, and, to-day, beyond a French name here and there, there is no trace of the original French immigrant. Being in the way of British colonial progress, the Boers were driven successively into Natal and the higher regions along the Vaal and Orange rivers. Fighting step by step and inch by inch against the hated *Rooi Baetji* (red-coats), as they call the British soldiers, the Boer was, at last, forced to face the strongest native tribes. It was in the struggle with these that his true nature was shown. His courage, determination, and piety were developed and confirmed by the difficulties encountered. Gradually the small, compact band that faced the hardships of the Transvaal districts beat back the Zulus and earned for themselves a rich pastoral country. It is his ignorance and non-progressiveness, united to his phlegmatic, stubborn nature—a result of these years of hardship—which have made him hated by the Uitlanders (foreigners). The men of greater civilization revile his ignorance, but do not comprehend his virtues—his piety, simple living, patriotism and blind, unreasoning faith in God and His Word.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But it is with the manners and customs of the Boer that I wish more particularly to deal. Loving his country, the Boer loves his home and family still more. While he likes a neighbor, he does not care that he should live less than ten miles from his home. It has often been said that a Boer, while standing on his own porch, hates to see the smoke from his neighbor's chimney; and this is true, but there is a cause for it. Living, as many of them do, in a land not too favored by nature, where long droughts make it almost impossible to find pasture for their flocks and cattle, and often compelled to *trek* in search of water, they have a natural desire to be free from the inroads of near neighbors whose cattle would eat the grass necessary for their own flocks and herds.

The houses of the average Boer are all alike and that of a Dopper, or strict Calvinistic Boer, may be taken as a sample. The house is of one story and built mainly of mud liberally plastered within and around a thick loose stone wall; the roof is flat, in order to catch the rain water—the only means of supplying his family with this element in a fairly pure condition. The house seldom contains more than from four to six rooms—the kitchen, a storeroom, and a few bedrooms—,and frequently has no doors except at the outer entrance. Close at hand will stand a rude out-house—a rough stable in which the master keeps his *trek* wagon and his few pet horses. A short distance from the house may be seen a thick wall of loose stones which on close inspection will prove to be a dam wall. The surrounding country slopes toward this wall and it is this natural watershed which is the sole supply of water to the farmer for himself and his herds for months at a time. Near the house may generally be seen one or two small huts, and in these sleep the herdsmen,—usually Hottentots or Kaffirs, taken as children in some raid and held in vassalage or mild slavery. These natives do all the work around and within the house, for the Boers of both sexes are not fond of farm work. Not far away may be seen a number of enclosures surrounded by low stone walls. These are the "kraals" in which the farmer keeps his herds and flocks at night, serving in time of danger as an admirable defence for the family. Herd- and hunting-dogs, more or less fierce, prowl around the premises and give warning of the approach of strangers or wild beasts.

One striking feature of Boer family life is the reverence paid by the juniors to their parents and seniors; even the married sons and their wives attending with reverence to the orders and advice of their parents and elders. The only reason that this is so—you are told if you ask—is that the Bible commands it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The daily life of a Boer family is a simple one: At daylight, all the members assemble in the main room—the kitchen and eating room, although most of the food is cooked in the open air—where the head of the family reads reverently a chapter or two from the Bible,—generally the Old Testament,—a simple, manly prayer is then offered, followed by the observance of an ancient Bible custom. A colored handmaid enters the room with a basin of water and a towel. The guest is first approached, and invited to wash his hands and face. The head of the family is next approached and so on around the room, until all have been included in the ceremony. This constitutes the day's ablutions of the family. They all sit around the board while the father says a long grace, and a stranger not familiar with their table manners is apt to be left in the lurch. Each man, for the women eat alone, selects the particular piece of meat that strikes his fancy and as soon as the "Amen" is spoken, sticks his fork into the piece selected. It happens sometimes that two select the same piece; then, the quickest man gets the booty. Dry bread, sometimes butter, and strong black coffee complete the bill of fare. It has been urged against the Boer that he is uncleanly, and this cannot be denied; but there is an excuse for this in the scarcity of water.

The men dress in loose fustian coat and trousers, dispensing with waistcoat, collar, etc. Their stockingless feet are encased in yellow *veldt schoens*—raw-hide shoes—without heels. The women dress in loose, unshaped, wrapper-like gowns and are innocent of the use of corsets. The men, as a rule, are tall, large-limbed, and well-formed; the women too are well-formed and tall.

The Boer never undresses on retiring to rest,—a habit contracted by reason of constant night alarms and attacks by native and other enemies, as well as by the constant need of being up and ready for the inroads of wild beasts on his herds and flocks. All his life has been one incessant preparation for attack from some quarter or another. His greatest friend—the rifle—lies by his side and at the slightest alarm the whole family are up and ready for defence. In fact his house is nothing more than a camp. Not a day goes by but young and old practise with the rifle, either on the deer that abound within short range of the house, or on inanimate targets. His one extravagance is in the purchase of a rifle. He will give large sums of money for a rifle that he fancies, and many hours are occupied in keeping his weapons clean. He always maintains a liberal supply of ammunition in the house, having been taught from long experience the necessity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of this single indulgence. The women can also shoot well, and in past history have defended the *laager* (fort) and homes in the absence of their male protectors. The small children are taught to load the guns and early become good shots. Ever since the great *trek* in 1834, when the Transvaal and Free State republics were formed, the hand of all races has been against them, and it is only by obstinate courage and invincible determination that the Boer has maintained his existence.

Courting among the race is a novel proceeding. A young man, having of course asked permission of his father to court the hand and heart of some neighboring damsel—by neighboring, I mean anywhere within fifty miles—proceeds to purchase the most loudly colored and decorated saddle-cloth for his horse that he can possibly find. He will spend large sums on this article of equine adornment, and one knowing the country can never mistake a young Boer going out courting. Mounted on his most spirited steed, he approaches the house of the father of his lady-love. Unlike the youth of more civilized life, he avoids the lady and seeks her father, from whom he reverentially asks permission to court his daughter. The old man returns no answer, but consults his *Vrou*, and the youth joins the young folks. No more notice is taken of him during the day, but if his request be agreeable to the parents, when the hour for retiring comes the mother solemnly approaches the young man and maiden with a long tallow candle in her hand. This she places on the table, lights, and bidding the couple an affectionate good-night, retires. This is the silent signal to the lover that his suit is successful. The young couple are permitted to sit up together in the kitchen so long as the candle lasts, when the lady retires to the one dormitory of herself and sisters and the youth shares the bed of the brothers or male portion of the family.

With the exception of the home religious ceremony already referred to, the only public one is that of the "Nachtmaal." This takes place every three months in the chief town of each district. It is simply a week of public prayer and the taking of the sacrament, but it is made somewhat of a feast as well, for it is the only time when the families in the district congregate. The little church during this week is seldom empty; services are constantly held and most of the marriages and baptisms are performed then, the rites being those of the Dutch Reformed Church. No music is used except in a very few of the churches, the hymns and chants being led by a clerk, but there can be no doubt of the simple reverence and earnestness of the worshippers. Atheism and its teachings are unknown to this little community of Christians,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and to cast a doubt on the teaching of the minister, generally a Hollander by birth, would be looked upon as a sacrilege.

A Boer marriage is an amusing affair. The lady is generally resplendent in a wedding dress, hired for the occasion at one of the few stores in the nearest town. At the town where I resided for some time, there were two rival stores and each had a wedding dress; it was always known by the color of the dress from which store it came. In the same way, the groom hires his suit. At the close of the ceremony the bride and groom kneel to the parents of each and receive a blessing. A married son generally builds on his father's land and is given a portion of the herds and cattle. At other times he *treks* to the frontier and "squats" for himself.

The historian Froude, in one of the few true assertions he made in his account of South Africa, stated that the Boer lived the nomadic life of Abraham and the forefathers. But this is only partially true. The Boer has a passionate love of home, and the nomadic life is at times forced upon him, as I have before stated, by frequent long droughts. At such times the huge tented *trek* wagon is drawn out of the stable; the household supplies are loaded into it, with the bedding, and all the horses are saddled. A long line of oxen is inspanned to the wagon, and, driving his herds and flocks before him, the Boer, as Father Abraham did, seeks with his family new pastures, in more favored spots. At the first heavy rains he returns to his home. A Boer family thus "on the *trek*" may frequently be met with, and the European traveller seeing it believes it to be their general mode of life.

Twice each year he loads his wagon with skins or wool, travels over the Drakensberg Mountains, and seeks the seaport of Natal, to dispose of his produce and purchase his few necessities. It has been urged against the Boers that they are dishonest and invariably try to cheat the trader. This is true, but it must be remembered that it is only a defensive measure against the greater cheating of the more skilful and educated trader. For years, the simple Boers were terribly fleeced, so much so that it was common talk and a matter of boasting among the storekeepers. The Boer at length discovered this, and, in defence, assumed the weapons of the wily storekeeper. Stones were put in the centre of wool bales to increase the weight, and other such practices indulged in. To such an extent has Boer thieving in stores been carried that detectives are placed there with instructions to watch every movement of the purchaser and his family. The storekeeper never charges them with theft, but the article taken is added

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the bill at three times its original value, and the poor Boer dares not object. It must be remembered that his dishonesty has been forced upon him by those who are now deriding his want of honesty. In daily life among themselves, the Boers are strictly honest. Their love of fair play and strict sense of justice are admitted by all unbiassed travellers. It has been strongly exemplified in their generous treatment of Dr. Jameson, as they know he is not the head but only the servant of others in carrying out his unsuccessful raid.

Cowardice has also been charged against the Boer. His fight against the British, in 1881, one would think, had settled this question. Men who have made the history that these men have, should receive more consideration. Six hundred Boers, with nothing but muzzle-loading *Roers* (old rifles), faced twelve thousand Zulus from behind their simple wagon defences and destroyed for years the power of that nation. The fact that they killed more than three thousand shows how stern the battle must have been. Even now the Uitlanders keep up the cry of cowardice against them; but their character is misunderstood. The European idea of bravery is to charge upon the foe in the open; but the Boer calls such bravery fool-hardiness and with scorn points out that if he and his forefathers had done the same there would be no Transvaal Republic to-day. He considers useless exposure of life a crime, and useless killing as irreligious. Thus while in ordinary cases his shrinking from battle would be part of his religion, in a holy war for the defence of his country and its institutions he can become brave even to recklessness.

The military system adopted by the nation is simple, and yet perfect in its way. Each district is commanded by a field cornet whose duty it is in case of alarm to issue notices to all in the district. An alarm is generally brought in by some herdsman or native hunter, who has accidentally run upon the enemy or heard some rumor of his approach. Mounted men at top speed are instantly despatched to all quarters of the district and in a short time every family, with household gear and herds, are *trekking* as quickly as possible to the district town in which is situated the *laager*. It takes but a comparatively short time for every white man, woman, and child to be safely ensconced. The defence attended to, riders are despatched to meet the foe and to bring news of his approach. Messengers are spurred to the capital to alarm the Government and within a few hours thousands of the finest shots and best equipped horsemen in the world have assembled in defence of their fatherland. The Boers seldom attack the foe;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their general plan is, as in the late Jameson raid, to hover around until a convenient piece of country is found, when, trusting to their prowess as shots and to the excellence of their horses to keep out of harm's way, they pour a deluge of lead on the foe from long distance. Hardly a man is to be seen, for every hiding-place is taken advantage of, and the well-trained horse, which comes at call, invariably conveys its rider out of danger when necessary. As to the excellence of their method of defensive warfare against large hordes of natives, it is only necessary to say that the British soldier in fighting the Zulu was defeated every time until he adopted the Boer's defence. This war-*laager* or defence deserves some explanation: When a Boer army advances into an enemy's country, it is accompanied by a long train of large wagons, containing the supplies, each drawn by from sixteen to eighteen oxen. Naturally, the progress is slow and whenever the natural outline of the country permits it, the enemy will ambush the train. The danger to such slow-moving vehicles and the ease with which they can be cut off by a large body of the enemy are easily seen; but the Boers found a method of defeating such attempts. Outriders give notice of the approach of the enemy and immediately a hollow square, made by the wagons being drawn up together with the oxen on the inside, is formed; openings for the horsemen are left and in an inconceivably short space of time a defence is made which has always proved successful in Boer warfare against natives. This, it will be seen, is a defence not only for the army, but also for the oxen and supplies.

Much has been said of the inhospitality of the Boers, and it is the fashion for recent writers to linger upon what they call this defect in his character. This is doing him a great wrong. Formerly, the Boer, in his rough, uncouth manner, was as hospitable as any race on the face of the earth; he had not much to give, but that which he had he gave, after the fashion taught by the Scriptures, with his whole heart; it was part of his religion to feed the stranger within his gates. So long as a white man rode to his door on horseback he was welcome, no matter what his race; but no feeling was shown for a man on foot, as, in accordance with the Boer habit of thought, a man unable to obtain a horse to ride could not be a reputable man. So far did their hospitality to the stranger extend that it was a mark of honor and trust, if no other bed were at hand, to permit the guest to sleep on the same mattress with the children of the host. This was before the discovery of diamonds. Subsequently, the seizure of those fields by the English and the consequent hatred engendered, the rush of deserting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sailors and soldiers, and adventurers of all descriptions in search of wealth, the frequent robberies and other outrages committed by these men on their way to the diamond-fields naturally caused the Boer to depart from his previous hospitality,—so that from being the most generous of hosts he became the most niggardly. At the same time, while he would turn the Englishman from his door,—the Scotchman and the Irishman, having also been treated unfairly by the English, were always welcome guests.

The extent of the Boer's reading is his Bible. Books and newspapers, to the majority, are an abomination. They hate everything that does not contribute directly to the prosperity of the family circle. Their houses are bare of all but absolutely necessary furniture; music is ignored and all refining influences are unknown in the house. Stock-breeding, native politics, psalm-singing, and hunting comprise the extent of their pleasures. How little interest these people take in their country, except as their fatherland, is shown by the fact that the great mineral wealth of the country was not discovered by them. Indeed great anger was expressed by some that gold and other minerals had been found by the Uitlanders. The children are now taught to read and to write, but beyond that all education is abhorred. The Boer is wife-ridden as well as priest-ridden. The wife is generally the better educated and, in matters of religion, war, and politics, controls her husband to a great extent. She is more advanced in ideas and more independent and it is doubtful if the late war of independence which ended at Majuba Hill would have been undertaken had it not been for the influence of the women of the country. No native-born Transvaaler ever keeps a store, the local trade being done entirely by the Uitlanders. The Boers hate trade and despise those who live by it. While little produce is grown, except for family consumption, the natural fertility of the country in the lower plains enables them to grow many fruits and luxuries with little labor; the orange grows almost everywhere, while tobacco, beautiful flowers of many varieties, corn, and other productions can be had for the simple turning over of the soil. This work is generally done by the native apprentices or slaves.

In referring to slavery, I would say that the most decided objection to the Boer—made by those who desire the establishment of British rule—is that slavery abounds in the Transvaal. Not only is this false, but I can witness to the fact that more slavery exists to-day under the British Government in Africa than under the republics. While the Boer exercises a mild sort of ownership over the children taken in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

battle or on forays, the men and women so taken never consider themselves slaves. They are well treated, except, of course, in occasional cases, and never feel the badge of servitude; on the other hand, in the British colonies the brutal native law is permitted and has the sanction of the Government. In Natal, for example, although the natives are accepted as British subjects and pay tribute to the crown, every wife is purchased from her father for ten head of cattle, the price being regulated by the Legislative Council of the country and approved by the governor. A girl so sold has no redress, and I have seen girls praying the resident magistrates of districts to defend them from some old native with many wives, to whom they had been sold, while the magistrate has stood willing but unable to aid them.

This sketch would be incomplete without a few words about President Krüger, who has of late come so prominently before the world. He is now seventy-two years old but active and healthy. In his youth and middle age he was known as one of the strongest men in the republic, and many stories are told of *Oom* Paul's feats of strength and courage. His features are almost expressionless, but his small dark eyes show the honest, kindly, meditative character of the man. He is not without a certain dignity, however, that commands respect and confidence. President Krüger is not a finished diplomat and statesman, but, discarding diplomacy, he takes up an issue straightforwardly, and it is this that has enabled him to carry his country successfully through so many difficulties. European diplomats find themselves outmanœuvred by this man, and the British Government has learned to respect his opinions and ideas.

The newspapers lately have informed us that the Uitlanders are denied citizenship. This is one of the many false assertions made by those interested in destroying the autonomy of the nation. The whites, whether citizens by birth or naturalized, after five years' residence and on payment of £25 (about $125), are entitled to take part in the election of the members of the Volksraad and of the President. For membership to the Raad and for the Presidency, only natives[1] or residents of fifteen years' standing, owners of real estate and professing the Protestant religion, are eligible. Since the British annexation and subsequent release of the country, all those who signed the petition for annexation to England are excluded from the right of suffrage

[1] At the present time the Transvaal has a population of about 500,000. Of this number more than 300,000 are black; 100,000 the floating gold-digging population, and the remainder Boers, with a few European traders and farmers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and from holding public office. This is only what would be done to traitors in any country, perhaps less than would be done in most.

Before closing this article, I would like to call attention to the oath signed by these so-called "barbarians" when, after two years of patient waiting, and despairing of justice from England, they reluctantly took up arms in the cause of liberty and right. This was signed by President Krüger and all the more prominent Boers previous to the war of 1881, which resulted in their present independence. It will strike most people that this is the oath of men who are to be respected, and who are likely to secure the sympathy of the great bulk of the civilized world. It reads as follows:—

"In the presence of Almighty God, the Searcher of hearts, and praying for His gracious assistance and mercy, we, burghers of the South African Republic, have solemnly agreed, for us and for our children, to unite in a holy covenant, which we confirm with a solemn oath. It is now forty years ago since our fathers left the Cape Colony to become a free and independent people. These forty years were forty years of sorrow and suffering. We have founded Natal, the Orange Free State, and the South African Republic, and three times has the English Government trampled upon our liberty. Our flag, baptised with the blood and tears of our fathers, has been pulled down. As by a thief in the night has our free Republic been stolen from us. We cannot suffer this and we may not. It is the will of God that the unity of our fathers and our love to our children should oblige us to deliver unto our children, unblemished, the heritage of our fathers. It is for this reason that we here unite, and give each other the hand as men and brethren, solemnly promising to be faithful to our country and people, and looking unto God, to work together unto death for the restoration of the liberty of our Republic. So truly help us God Almighty."

These men have been maligned. I am Afrikander enough to know that the despatches daily appearing in the public prints are written in the interest of those who originated the present disturbances. Not one tenth of the assertions made in those despatches are true, and it will be seen, when time permits a retrospect, that the so-called "reforms" said to be needed in the gold-fields are nothing but a tissue of absurd claims by men, the majority of whom are non-residents of the Republic and are there simply in the interest of selfish gain. That the present uprising has an object is plain, and it is also apparent that Cecil Rhodes, who with his associates has already gobbled up the Griqualand West diamond-fields and Matabeleland, is at the bottom of it.

The question now arises: "What will be the next move of these conspirators?" To me, this seems evident: Cecil Rhodes is the leader of a large party in Cape Colony, Natal, the diamond-fields, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

especially Matabeleland, where the British South Africa Company reigns paramount. His desire is to seize the rich gold-fields for the chartered company, as he has already done the diamond-fields. Standing like a rock in his way is the Government of this little band of pioneers. Under Boer law, the natural increment of the soil cannot belong to individuals, but only to the Government. Individuals can dig, on payment of a tax on all that they obtain from the soil; but all minerals, until dug, belong to the Government. Of course, under such a law, it would be impossible for men to form a trust in this mineral. Rhodes sees this and his first object is to wipe out the Government that stands in his way. He knows that with the advent of British rule British laws will prevail and that it would take him and his rich associates but a short time to own the gold-fields. His scheme to obtain the aid of England has so far collapsed, but there is a deeper and broader one yet to be tried. Foiled by the English Government, he will now advocate an independent, united South Africa. It is safe to say that if Rhodes boldly takes this course, he will be supported by the majority of the residents of British South Africa as well as by a strong influence at home,—where numbers of the rich and aristocratic are interested in his financial adventures. Once the colonies are free from British rule, the subjection of the Boer republics will, of course, simply be a matter of time. It remains to be seen, if this plan be carried out, whether England will adhere to her promise to the Boer republics to maintain their independence on condition that she should hold control over them in the matter of foreign treaties.

If the South Africans desire independence, it is hard to see how England can refuse it; and if England refuses, it is equally hard to see how she can retain her influence. It must be remembered that the British colonist, as a rule, is well educated and progressive, imbued with a high opinion of the freedom that should be enjoyed by the Briton; and he would be the first to take up arms against any forced restraint imposed by the paternal Government. This may be looked upon as absurd reasoning, but time will show. I have had fourteen years' experience in Africa, and I know well the feeling of the residents of each state and colony.

T. Loraine White.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED